DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 720 CG 005 962

AUTHOR	Silverman, Manuel Stewart
TITLE	Effects of Differential Practicum Experiences on Client and Counselor Perceptions of Initial Interviews.
PUB DATE	Jun 69
NOTE	138p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.00
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavioral Counseling, College Students, Counseling, *Counselor Training, Interviews, Learning Activities, *Perception, Performance, *Practicums, Practicum Supervision, *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates two types of practicum experiences: (1) experiential introspective; and (2) didactic-behavioristic. The hypotheses tested include: (1) there are no differences between mean responses of the counselees in the two above groups; (2) there are no differences between mean responses of the counselors in the two groups; (3) there are no differences between mean responses of group one (experiential-introspective) counselors and their counselees, or between group two (didactic-behavioristic) counselors and their counselees. The instruments used were the Therapy Session Report, Form P and Form T. Results include: (1) both counselors and counselees in group one differed in their perceptions of the counseling session from group two; (2) group one counselors differed from their clients in some perceptions of the counseling sessions; (3) group two counselors differed from their clients in some perceptions of the counseling sessions. Analysis of the data indicated the rejection of all four null hypotheses. (Author/KJ)

ED0 44720

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

EFFECTS OF DIFFERENTIAL PRACTICUM EXPERIENCES
ON CLIENT AND COUNSELOR PERCEPTIONS
OF INITIAL INTERVIEWS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Field of Education

by

MANUEL STEWART SILVERMAN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Evanston, Illinois

June 1969

CG 005 962

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

At a time such as this, thanks are due to many. I am especially indepted to Dr. Frank W. Miller, Chairman of my Doctoral Committee. Little does Dr. Miller know how truly influential his guidance has been in shaping me as well as my career. Gratitude is also expressed to the other committee members, Dr. Frank S. Endicott and Dr. B. Claude Mathis for their interest and support throughout my stay at Northwestern University.

I would also like to thank the practicum participants who were the subjects of this study and specifically acknowledge the assistance of the Counseling Staff who supervised the administration and collection of the questionnaires. Without the sincere efforts of the Staff on my behalf, this study would have been impossible to complete.

An additional debt, impossible to repay, is also acknowledged to my parents, whose "non-directive" efforts seem to have fostered some positive results.

Finally, I wish to thank my wife, Sharon, who, although a little more "directive", has been a constant source of encouragement and strength.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Background of the problem 1

Statement of the problem 2

Hypotheses 3

Definitions of terms used 4

Limitations of the study 6

Organization of the study 7

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 9

Introduction 9

Personality characteristics and counselor effectiveness 9

Counselor and client perceptions of the therapeutic relationship 17

III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY 27

Lewis' study 27

Population 27

Instruments 30

Procedures 34

IV. RESULTS 40

Differences between Group I and Group II counselees 40

Differences between Group I and Group II counselors 43

CHAPTER PAGE

Differences between Group I counselors and counselees 45

Differences between Group II counselors and counselees 55

Summary 65

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 66

Summary 66

Conclusions 69

Recommendations 72

BIBLIOGRAPHY 75

APPENDIX A: COUNSELING SESSION REPORT, Form Counselee 78

APPENDIX B: COUNSELING SESSION REPORT, Form Counselor 91

APPENDIX C: DIRECTIONS TO COUNSELORS 104

APPENDIX D: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES 105

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Counselor Sample Characteristics 29

II. Client Sample Characteristics 30

III. Comparison of Mean Scores of Group I and Group II Counselees 41

IV. Comparison of Mean Scores of Group I and Group II Counselors 43

V. Group I Responses to Section One 46

VI. Group I Responses to Section Two 46

VII. Group I Responses to Section Three 47

VIII. Group I Responses to Section Four 48

IX. Group I Responses to Section Five 49

X. Group I Responses to Section Six 50

XI. Group I Responses to Section Seven 50

XII. Group I Responses to Section Eight 51

XIII. Group I Responses to Section Nine 52

XIV. Group I Responses to Section Ten 53

XV. Group I Responses to Section Eleven 53

XVI. Group II Responses to Section One 55

XVII. Group II Responses to Section Two 56

XVIII. Group II Responses to Section Three 57

XIX. Group II Responses to Section Four 58

XX. Group II Responses to Section Five 59

XXI. Group II Responses to Section Six 60

XXII. Group II Responses to Section Seven 60

TABLE PAGE

XXIII. Group II Responses to Section Eight 61

XXIV. Group II Responses to Section Nine 62

XXV. Group II Responses to Section Ten 63

XXVI. Group II Responses to Section Eleven 63

XXVII. Comparison of Mean Scores of Counselors and their Counselees by Groups 105

XXVIII. Comparison of Mean Scores of Counselors and Counselees Across Groups 116

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Counselor education programs offering master's degrees in counseling and guidance have the expressed task of preparing personnel for schools. Counselor educators have long been asking themselves and others how best to train students who wish to become counselors. Entire issues of professional journals have been devoted to the topic, and it has even been the subject of entire volumes.[1]

Lewis,[2] in her research at Northwestern University, attempted to measure the effects of two different methods of practicum training. She did this by an analysis of attitude changes on the part of counseling practicum participants. As the specific criterion measures of "desirable" counselor attitudes, Lewis used the six basic qualities of the effective counselor as listed in the Statement of Policy of the American Personnel and Guidance Association:

> 1. Belief in Each Individual: The counselor believes in the worth inherent in each individual, in his capacity for growth and change, and in his ability to cope with life situations. He has confidence in the individual's capacity to establish appropriate values and goals. He believes that under favorable conditions each individual can develop in directions beneficial to himself and to society.
>
> 2. Commitment to Individual Human Values: The counselor has a primary concern for the individual as a person whose feelings, values, goals, and success are important. The counselor respects and appreciates individuality including the right and need of those whom he counsels to find their own best values, to determine their own goals, and to find ways to achieve these goals. He is concerned with facilitating this process in a manner that is helpful to the individual and to society.
>
> 3. Alertness to the World: The counselor is interested in the world. He is interested in understanding man, in the forces

which affect his goals, and his progress in achieving these goals. He is a person for whom the strivings, the achievements, and the creations of mankind have meaning and add richness to life.

4. Openmindedness: The counselor has respect for a wide range of interests, attitudes, and beliefs. He is willing to question the old and investigate the new. He is receptive to new ideas, achievements, and research findings.

5. Understanding of Self: The counselor has an understanding of himself and the ways in which his personal values, feelings, and needs can affect his work. He is able to handle these aspects of his own life in ways that do not have an adverse effect upon his counseling work. He has a recognition of his own limitations and is able to make judgments as to when his limitations require referral to others better able to assist the counselee.

6. Professional Commitment: The counselor feels a commitment to counseling as a profession and as a means of assisting individuals in the development of their potentialities. He has an appreciation of his responsibility to his counselees and to society and insists on sound practices to fulfill this responsibility. He has sufficient personal integrity and professional competence to enable him to cope with pressures inconsistent with a respect for the individual in a democratic society.[3]

In a further analysis of the data, Lewis grouped the above criteria under three general headings: attitudes toward self; attitudes toward others; and intellectual attitudes. The Lewis study formed the basis for this research and will be briefly described in the statement of the problem. A more detailed description will be found in Chapter III.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Lewis's study involved the manipulation of practicum experiences for two groups of student counselors. The two types of experiences were the experiential-introspective approach and the didactic-behavioristic approach. Both are described in detail in the definition of terms. Using a battery of pre and post-treatment instruments, Lewis set out to determine whether one or the other method of instruction was more effective. Criteria for effectiveness was represented by the American

Personnel and Guidance Association standards previously quoted. One basic question, then, was the concern of Lewis's study. *Which of two methods of conducting a practicum brings about the most constructive attitudinal changes in the counselor candidate*?

This present research concerned itself with what was felt to be an equally important subsequent question which grew out of a close association with Lewis's work. *Which of these two methods of conducting a practicum brought about more successful counseling as perceived by these counselors and their counselees*? Do counselors trained by these two methods behave differentially in actual counseling sessions? Is their behavior perceived differentially by their clients? If there are differences, will counselors trained by the *experiential-introspective* method or those trained by the *didactic-behavioristic* method be better attuned to the needs and wants of their counselees and be better able to objectively define these needs?

III. HYPOTHESES

The following specific null hypotheses were tested:

1. *There are no differences between mean responses of the counselees in the two groups*.

2. *There are no differences between mean responses of the counselors in the two groups*.

3. *There are no differences between mean responses of Group I (experiential-introspective) counselors and their counselees*.

4. *There are no differences between mean responses of Group II (didactic-behavioristic) counselors and their counselees*.

IV. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The following terms are used extensively in this study and need further definition.

Practicum. The practicum is a course designed to give the candidate experience in the practical application and integration of the principles and methods he has studied. The winter quarter practicum prepares the candidates for counseling with actual clients during the spring quarter.[4] This preparation is accomplished primarily by (1) role-playing as a counselor or counselee with classmates, (2) role-playing as a counselor with a supervisor taking the role of the counselee, and (3) observing experienced counselors. Specific techniques unique to the training of the subjects in this study are further identified in Chapter III.

Supervised Experience in Counseling. This is a course designed to give the candidates actual counseling experience with students of elementary, secondary, or college age.[5] The candidates have the opportunity to visit schools and counsel students. Occasionally student concerns are of a personal-social nature, but generally the counseling involves educational and vocational matters.

Group I (experiential-introspective). The major task with this group during the practicum was to provide an environment and set of experiences that would stimulate introspection and self-analysis processes within the candidates. This procedure was based on the theory that perceptive communication with others begins with a sensitive understanding of oneself and an openness to and respect for the widest possible range of experiencing "oneself." Only when the counselor has a profound depth of understanding of his own personal needs, insecurities, and conflicts can he be sure that they do not intrude in a deleterious manner in his counseling. When he can trust his own motives, he will be open to the feedback that he receives from the counselee, and will be most effective as a counselor.

Implicit in this viewpoint is a basic equation of valuing the client to the degree one values oneself. That is, how one thinks and feels about others is nothing more than a reflection of how one thinks and feels about oneself. The same conditions of safety and freedom were provided the candidates as are provided in actual counseling situations. Candidates were encouraged to be open and willing to experiment. The anticipated result was greater self-development and self-actualization.

In brief, the tasks of each member of this group were to learn who he is and is becoming, and to learn counseling primarily through experiencing some of its ingredients.

Group II (didactic-behavioristic). The focus of work for this group during the practicum was exclusively on communication in counseling as demonstrated by "others." These others were (1) experienced, more "knowing" role models, observed through films, audio and video tapes, and one-way vision screens; and (2) other students, both former practicum participants and present classmates. At no time did the candidates in this group have any feedback on their performances, thus helping to inhibit any tendencies to self-analyze or become introspective.

A traditional, didactic, lecture-discussion approach was used in the classroom to react to the verbal and non-verbal communication techniques being observed. Reinforcement of "correct" procedures was stressed, with the instructor serving as the main reinforcing agent.

Class members also served to shape the learning of each other through their participation in class. Supervision represented the conscious effort to program the candidates with a repertoire of correct counseling responses.

The task, then, of the members of this group was to assume desired counselor attitudes and behavior via the shaping effects of traditional educative procedures.

V. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There are certain limitations that should be considered in any research effort. The following limitations apply to this particular study:

1. The sample for this study consisted of 20 graduate students in supervised counseling experience working with 133 clients in initial sessions. Any generalizations of the findings to other populations should be quite guarded.

2. A second limitation of this study was the fact that it encompassed only two groups of students trained at one particular institution. With greater amounts of time, staff, and funds, the experiment might have had broader value if carried out at several institutions simultaneously.

3. The age range of the clients constituted another limiting factor. The great majority of the counselees were high school juniors. Therefore results are most applicable to this age group.

4. A further limitation was the exclusive use of the Counseling Session Report. Counselee and counselor perceptions of sessions were being measured, and the Counseling Session Report was specifically

constructed for this task. For any further examination, additional instruments would be needed.

5. An additional limitation of any questionnaire study involves the degree of accuracy of the responses. In this particular study the perceptions of the participants were being examined. It is assumed that the participants responded honestly and accurately to the questionnaire.

6. A final limitation of this study concerned the relatively poorer response rate on the part of the counselors. Every client turned in a completed or almost completed questionnaire. However, a group of counselor forms from one high school trip was never returned to the university. Although the mean number of counselee responses per item is 133, the mean number of counselor responses is 110. Hopefully, some future replication or similar study will more nearly achieve 100% participation from subjects.

VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I has presented an introduction to the study. Chapter II will survey the literature most relevant to the purpose and scope of this study. Chapter III briefly outlines Lewis's research as an antecedent to this effort; and it also describes the client and counselor population, the instrument used, and the procedures of the experiment. Results are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V will offer summary, conclusions, and recommendations, based on the results.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Review of Educational Research, Vol. 36, No. 2 (April, 1966).

[2] Gloria J. Lewis, "Approaches to Counseling Practicum: A Comparison of the Introspective-Experiential and the Didactic-Behavioristic Paradigms," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University), 1969.

[3] American Personnel and Guidance Association, The Counselor: Professional Preparation and Role: A Statement of Policy. Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 42, No. 5 (January, 1964), pp. 536-541.

[4] School of Education, Northwestern University, brochure on counselor education program, 1967.

[5] Northwestern University, Announcement of courses in the Graduate School (1967-68 and 1968-69), p. 84.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

In a previous study, Lewis has reviewed an exhaustive amount of literature dealing with practicum training methods and counselor attitudes. Over 100 studies are referred to in 167 footnotes in her review of the literature.[1] Because of the close relationship between her study and this effort, reference material has been delimited to include only recent research that has special relevance for improvement of methods of training counselors.

The following sections will review research which (1) explores counselor personality characteristics and (2) examines counselor and client perceptions of counseling.

II. PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND COUNSELOR EFFECTIVENESS

The purpose of this section is to review recent literature to examine those counselor characteristics which various authors feel are related to counseling effectiveness.

A study by Johnson, Shertzer, Linden, and Stone[2] indicated that counselors, peers, and supervisors were largely in agreement when judging which counselors were effective and which were not. They all seemed to have similar qualities in mind in terms of their judging, and they were similarly able to distinguish their presence or absence in counselors. Generally, agreement regarding definitions of counselor effectiveness seems prevalent among various authors as well as the subjects of this study. No general definitions will be offered now, and the frames of reference of the authors of each study will be accepted. In every case, however, the successful counselor seems to be nonthreatening, sincere, and truly interested in the welfare of his counselee.

One typical and widely used experimental procedure for determining those characteristics which may accompany counselor effectiveness has been to administer personality inventories to the counselors and then correlate the results with effectiveness ratings by impartial judges. In a study by Stefflre, King, and Leafgren,[3] forty participants in a semester long NDEA Guidance and Counseling Institute judged each other as potential counselors. The nine "most chosen" participants were compared on a number of variables with the nine who were "least chosen." The "most chosen" participants had higher academic performance, somewhat more appropriate scores on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, and less dogmatism as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The two groups did not differ on the Educational Interest Inventory, the Test of Vocational Values, or the Taylor Anxiety Scale. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule yielded four scales out of fifteen which discriminated between the two groups. Counselors who were "most chosen" obtained higher scores on Deference and Order, and lower scores on Abasement and Agression. Stefflre, King, and Leafgren report one other result of interest. Although there was little agreement among counselors regarding the reasons they had for choosing others as potential counselors, there was remarkable accuracy in choosing both those who were later sought out as counselors and those who were not.

Rosen[4] employed a multiple regression technique to determine personality characteristics which correlated with counselor competency. The personal characteristics were measured at the beginning of training with the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, the Social Service group of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Dogmatism Scale D, the NDEA Examination in Guidance and Counseling, teaching and counseling experience, and the age of the counselors. The four best combinations of personal predictors were determined through multiple regression analysis. Unfortunately, none of the characteristics included in the study was found to be significantly related to any competency factors.

Demos and Zawaylif[5] examined the ratings of student counselors made by their supervisors. They found no significant differences between counselors judged by supervisors as being most successful and those judged as being least successful when compared on the Study of Values and the Kuder Preference Record (personal). Comparison of responses on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule revealed that counselors judged as most effective had greater Nurturance and Affiliation scores and lower Autonomy, Abasement, and Agression scores. Although these results seem to make sense, other authors have suggested that the differences in this particular study could have occurred by chance. Mills and Mencke[6] took particular issue with these findings. They criticized the methodology used in evaluating the statistical significance of the data and concluded that the differences found between the effective and noneffective counselors on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule were not significant. Of course, keeping in mind the myriad of limitations to "hard" research in Guidance and Counseling, even results which approach significance should not be summarily rejected and discarded.

Even knowledge of methods and techniques of counseling has been shown to be apparently unrelated to counseling ability or effectiveness. Joslin[7] found no significant relationship between knowledge of counseling and guidance and counseling competence at either the beginning or end of a training practicum. There were no significant correlations between specific areas of subject matter and logically related dimensions of counseling competence. Joslin concluded that greater emphasis must be placed on emotional and attitudinal factors in the preparation and training of counselors.

Allen[8] seems to be in agreement and suggests looking to higher order personality variables as correlates of counselor effectiveness. He sees little hope in the "trait-factor" approach to determining characteristics of effective counselors. Allen administered the Rorschach test to 26 graduate students in an introductory practicum and recorded the freedom with which each responded. This was purported to be an indication of how comfortable the subjects were with their thoughts and feelings. The freedom on the Rorschach was found to be directly related to the degree of overall competence attributed to the students by their supervisors. Also, a direct relationship was found between the degree to which the students acknowledged their own feelings regarding their initial experiences in counseling and the supervisors' ratings of their competence as counselors. Academic predictors, including the Graduate Record Examination, Miller Analogy

Test, grade point average, number of courses in psychology, and admissions ratings, were not significantly related to rated competency. A result approaching significance that has relevance to this present study was that the more open students responded to the feelings of their clients with greater frequency than did their less open peers ($p < .10$). Allen's findings lend some credence to his opinion that psychological openness, a higher order personality variable, is related to counselor competency and effectiveness.

Combs and Soper[9] requested 29 counselors in training enrolled in a graduate course in personality dynamics to report four human relations incidents in which each was involved. The protocols were rated independently by trained judges without any knowledge of the subjects. The judges rated the protocols on the basis of twelve perceptual variables; including a general perceptual orientation, perceptions of other people, perceptions of self, and perceptions of counseling purposes. The students were rank ordered by their supervisors with regard to their promise as counselors. This rank order was correlated with the rank order on each of the twelve perceptual scales which were applied to the protocols. All of the rank order correlations were significant at the .05 level or beyond. This data, then, strongly suggests that counselor effectiveness is related to perceptions of self and others, perceptions of counseling purposes, and general orientation on the part of the counselors.

Perceptions of self and others can hardly be mentioned without alluding to Carl Rogers. Among his many contributions, Rogers[10] has set forth conditions which he believes to be necessary for therapeutic personality change to take place on the part of the client. The therapist characteristics which Rogers listed seem to summarize much of the findings implied, discovered, or vaguely hinted at in the previously mentioned efforts. The therapist characteristics he listed include personal integration and congruency, genuineness, unconditional positive regard for the client, an empathic understanding of the client's internal frame of reference, and the ability to communicate this understanding to the client. These characteristics imply a good deal of acceptance of the client on the part of the counselor. It seems most authors agree that acceptance on the part of the counselor is a necessary prerequisite for effectiveness.

To test this belief, Waskow[11] hypothesized that the degree of counselor acceptance, interest, non-judgmentalness, and expressiveness is directly related to the degree to which the client, fairly early in counseling, both discusses and expresses his feelings. The results of this study were significant, but in the direction opposite to that predicted. That is, the more judgmental the counselor was, the sooner the client began to discuss his feelings. In discussing these unexpected findings, Waskow suggested that although the client faced with a judgmental counselor was talking more about his feelings during early sessions, he may not have been dealing with those feelings in a meaningful and therapeutic way -- as he would be with a less judgmental counselor.

Truax, along with various associates, has undertaken several research projects which have attempted to examine the affective factors in counseling. In one article, Truax[12] reviewed and discussed findings from a five year research program. The program studied the effects of the therapists' levels of (a) accurate empathic understanding of the patient, (b) unconditional positive warmth for the patient, and (c) therapist self-congruence or genuineness. The evidence, according to Truax, seemed to clearly point to the importance of accurate empathy, unconditional positive regard, and congruence in successful psychotherapy. The therapist must have the ability to understand sensitively and accurately the patient and to communicate this understanding in a language attuned to the patient's current feelings. Also, the therapeutic relationship must involve both genuineness and non-possessive warmth.

Truax and Carkhuff[13] examined the relationship between therapist transparency or self-congruence and the patient's level of self-disclosure. Their research dealt with the testing of two hypotheses: one, that the greater the degree of transparency, self-disclosure, or self-exploration by the patient in the therapeutic encounter, the greater will be the evidence of constructive personality change in the patient's total sphere of living; two, the greater the degree of transparence or self-congruence in the therapist, the greater the degree of transparency, self-disclosure, or self-exploration in the patient. Both hypotheses were significantly supported by the experimental findings. The client samples included both hospitalized patients and a group of juvenile delinquents. Findings were based on an analysis of segments of tapes of group sessions. The analysis was to determine the level of self-disclosure or transparency. Although therapist transparency did influence patient transparency, constructive personality change did not occur to the same degree in the juvenile delinquent population as in the hospitalized sample. It may well be argued that peer relations, group expectations, or simply problems of a less severe nature could have caused this particular phenomenon. Regardless of cause, this result does limit the generality of the supported hypotheses. It seems safe to assume, however, that therapist openness does indeed influence patient openness.

Carkhuff and Alexik[14] have accepted Truax's terms of empathy, respect, and genuineness as necessary counselor attributes; and they have proceeded to demonstrate their importance experimentally. In this particular experiment eight experienced counselors were used as subjects. They were seen for one hour by a "client" who experimentally manipulated the depth of her self-exploration. During the first and last thirds of the hour interview she explored herself deeply, but during the middle third she reduced the depth of her self-exploration by discussing irrelevant and impersonal material. Counselors who had been functioning at a low level of empathy, respect, and genuineness failed to reestablish the levels of facilitative conditions which they had offered during the initial third of the interviews. On the other hand, counselors who had been functioning at high levels of facilitative conditions were not manipulated by the lowering of self-exploration and continued to function at high levels of facilitation, even with some tendency for the higher counselors to increase their levels of facilitation.

A further study by Kratochvil, Aspy, and Carkhuff[15] suggested that, for effectiveness, the counselor's direction of growth of change in level of functioning, was more important than the counselor's absolute level of functioning.

III. COUNSELOR AND CLIENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE THERAPEUTIC RELATIONSHIP

Feifel and Eels[16] analyzed the perceptions of both patients and their psychotherapists at the close of psychotherapy as to changes taking place and ideas about what was helpful and what was not helpful. In this particular study, 63 outpatients and their 28 therapists responded to open-ended questionnaires. Major results showed that expectancies and conceptualizations of therapy differed between clients and therapists. Therapists were more concerned with technique, symptomatic relief, and improvement in social relationships; clients were more concerned with self-understanding and self-confidence. Clients seemed more concerned about the "human" aspects of the therapist as being helpful, rather than his technical skills. The implication to be drawn from this study, quite relevant to this present effort, is, that from the client's point of view, the therapist's contribution is definitely personal as well as technical.

Board[17] studied patient and physician (psychiatrist) judgments concerning outcome of psychotherapy in an out-patient clinic. His results showed that patients equated successful therapy with being permitted to express their problems, gaining self-insights, and having interested and understanding therapists. Unsuccessful therapy was associated essentially with noninterest on the part of the therapist and assignment to multiple therapists. In light of the results of that will be discussed in Chapters IV and V. It is important to particularly note that in this study by Board, patients did feel that understanding therapists were more successful.

An attempt was made by Canon[18] in his dissertation to lend support to Snyder's definition of the therapy relationship. Snyder[19] defined the therapy relationship as the reciprocity of various sets of affective attitudes which two or more persons hold toward each other in psychotherapy. In effect then, the expression of positive-negative affect of therapist and client should vary directly with each other. In Canon's study, measures of client and counselor autonomy, alienation and withdrawal, guardedness, and the interactions of these variables between the client and his counselor were employed as predictor variables in an analysis of regression design where several estimates of counselor-client affect were offered as criterion variables. Data came from the use of a slightly revised version of Snyder's PAC-NAC and PAT-NAT scales to represent an index of the positive and negative attitudes of the client and therapist toward each other. Canon hoped to eventually link the affect variables to personality variables of the counselor and client.

Counselor and client samples (N=18 and 121) were drawn from eight university counseling centers across the nation. Personality variables were obtained prior to interviews, and the affect scales were completed immediately after initial sessions. Only initial sessions were examined. In discussing his results, Canon reported that the study suffered from a number of limitations, reflected in the fact that in no case was more than 13% of the variance-in-common accounted for in any statistical test. Canon stated: "All of the subsequent discussion should be read with such thimble-full proportions in mind."[20] In light of the poor correlation of affect, Canon concluded that some caution should be used in referring to the counseling relationship --

at least in initial interviews -- as though there were feelings that the client and counselor held in common, or as though both had similar perceptions of their affective interaction.

> "It may be possible--and necessary--to think of the counseling relationship as something other than reciprocity of affect between the participants. To determine the nature of this relationship it would seem necessary to include a wider range of personality variables, to control for the presenting problem of the client, and to observe counselor-client affect over a series of interviews."[21]

Basically then, since Canon was unable to demonstrate relationship between counselor and client affect and any personality variables, and also unable to relate the affect between the counselor and client; he suggests further research where tighter controls are employed.

While working with Rogers, first at Ohio State University, and then at the University of Chicago, Barrett-Lennard[22] studied the process of client-centered therapy from the viewpoints of both therapist and client. In the research being reviewed here, his expressed task was to attempt to connect cause and effect in the therapeutic process. He devised and administered a questionnaire which measured empathic understanding, level of regard, unconditionality of regard, congruence, and willingness to be known. The device was called *The Relationship Inventory*, prepared in parallel forms for therapist and client. This instrument is a predecessor to the *Counseling Session Report* used in this present study. Barrett-Lennard worked with counselors at the University of Chicago Counseling Center, administering the inventory to them and their clients after five, ten, fifteen, and twenty-five sessions, and/or at the termination of therapy. In this work, he compared the relative effectiveness of those counselors with little or no experience to those counselors who were relatively more experienced. Although Groups I and II of the present study differ somewhat in their makeup, all being relatively inexperienced, generalizations can be drawn, especially in light of some of Barrett-Lennard's hypotheses and subsequent results.

Barrett-Lennard hypothesized that perceived relationships would be better for clients with more experienced therapists than for clients with less experienced therapists. He also hypothesized that there would be greater agreement between client and therapist perceptions of their relationship, in terms of their scores on each of the five dimensions, in the case of more experienced therapists and their clients than in the case of less experienced therapists and their clients.[23] Barrett-Lennard found the more experienced therapists viewing themselves and being viewed more consistently than the less experienced therapists.[24] ($p < .10$) This finding, of the less experienced being seen as more variable, is consistent with the earlier conclusions of Feidler and Strupp.[25] A rather striking conclusion which relates to the present research was the substantial and strongly significant difference in the levels of client-therapist discrepancy for the variable of empathic understanding. According to Barrett-Lennard's work, it would appear that more experienced therapists do, in fact, communicate their understanding much more unambiguously than do inexperienced therapists. Possibly too, the more experienced therapist is able to identify and report with greater accuracy than the inexperienced just what understanding of his client he is actually experiencing. Although there are several limitations to the generalizability of

Barrett-Lennard's work, it could be expected that those counselors who better communicated their understanding to their clients could be thought of as the better counselors.

In a different study at the University of Chicago, Bown[26] also studied the patient-therapist relationship. His effort was rather long-term in nature, and intensive, rather than extensive. His sample included only six clients, but he studied them over the course of twenty sessions of non-directive therapy. Q sort ratings of the quality of the relationship were obtained from each patient-therapist pair at four points during treatment. For therapy characterized as successful, in terms of independent outcome ratings and continuance, Bown reported that:

> "the quality of the actual relationship as perceived by both therapist and client was substantially different from the quality of the relationship in unsuccessful therapy."[27]

It is of additional interest to note that the clients' perceptions of the relationship more accurately distinguished between the successful and the unsuccessful cases than did those perceptions of the therapists. This particular result will be further discussed in Chapters IV and V as it applies to the results of this present study. Of additional relevance to this present effort is Bown's finding that the degree of similarity or congruence in the client and therapist's perception of their relationship was positively correlated with rated success. The greater the degree of agreement on the nature of their relationship, the greater the degree of rated improvement.

Efforts like Bown's and Barrett-Lennard's have explored a relatively uncharted area in the fields of counseling and psychotherapy: client and therapist perceptions of their relationship and of the therapy process. In a rather recent article, their former professor, Carl Rogers,[28] outlined fairly succinctly the rationale, not only for their efforts, but this current study as well. In this article, Rogers spoke of positive attitudinal patterns in the therapist. He specifically mentioned an attitude of genuineness, an attitude of warmth and acceptance, and an accurate empathic understanding of the client's private world. These are basically the same features which he wrote of in the 1957 article[29] previously mentioned in this review. Also, he did go on to mention something quite relevant to his particular study:

> "Constructive personality change comes about only when the client perceives and experiences a certain psychological climate in the relationship. The elements of this climate do not consist of knowledge, intellectual training, intellectual orientation in psychotherapy, or techniques. They are feelings or attitudes which must be experienced by the therapist and perceived by the client if they are to be effective."[30]

This quote can be termed a cornerstone in the building of the hypotheses of this study. Much of the research examining characteristics of counselors gives us little more than common sense answers. The studies of client and counselor perceptions of therapy are somewhat more fruitful in opening new areas of research. Regarding the conclusions of these studies, one test of effectiveness seems to have been useful. "Successful" sessions have been characterized by greater agreement between client and counselor in their perceptions of the sessions. This measure of effectiveness is employed through the testing of hypotheses three and four.

One final study is appropriate for inclusion. Schoch[31] attempted to measure practicum counselors' behavioral changes when working with actual clients, basically the exact task of this present study. Schoch's results consisted of change scores over a four to six week period on an instrument devised by Combs and Soper.[32] The instrument was intended to identify the "good" counselor. Using it, three independent judges scored the first and last tapes for each counselor. Although all hypotheses are significantly supported in the intended direction, the results must be interpreted cautiously. The size of the sample is not revealed, the identity of the judges is also kept from the reader, and most important, judges, not the counselors and their clients do the ratings. Although Schoch set as his purpose the examination of the ability to carry on the role of a counselor in a counseling relationship, he did not question the principal parties involved.

Along with others, Lewis[33] has already answered those who ask about immediate practicum effects. She has found significant differences among practicum participants' attitudes at the end of differential practicum experiences. This study will utilize the subjects of Lewis's research and attempt to answer the questions which Schoch poses:

> "There is research evidence that attitudes of counselors do change as a result of participation in counselor preparation programs, but there is no evidence that attitudinal changes, or changes in concepts, also cause behavioral changes in counseling relationships. Improvement of an individual's ability to perform the role of a counselor is tantamount to the success of any counselor preparation program."[34]

> "The question then becomes one of attempting to discover if a counselor preparation program is providing those kinds of experiences which improve the ability to carry on the role of a counselor in a counseling relationship."[35]

FOOTNOTES

[1] Gloria J. Lewis, Approaches to Counseling Practicum: A Comparison of the Introspective-Experiential and the Didactic-Behavioristic Paradigms, (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University) 1969.

[2] Dorothy B. Johnson, B. Shertzer, J. E. Linden, and S. C. Stone, "The Relation of Counselor Candidate Characteristics and Counseling Effectiveness," Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 6, No. 4, (1967), pp. 297-304.

[3] Buford Stefflre, Paul King, and Fred Leafgren, "Characteristics of Counselors Judged Effective by Their Peers," Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vo. 9, No. 4 (1962), pp. 335-340.

[4] Julius Rosen, "Multiple-regression Analysis of Counselor Characteristics and Competencies," Psychological Reports, Vol. 20, No. 3 (1967), pp. 1003-1008.

[5] G. D. Demos, and F. H. Zawaylif, "Characteristics of Effective Counselors," Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 5, No. 3 (1966) pp. 163-165.

[6] D. H. Mills, and R. Mencke, "Characteristics of Effective Counselors: A Reevaluation," Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 6, No. 4 (1967), pp. 332-334.

[7] Leeman C. Joslin, Jr., "Knowledge and Counselor Competence," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 43, No. 8 (1965), pp. 790-795.

[8] Thomas W. Allen, "Effectiveness of Counselor Trainees as a Function of Psychological Openness," Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 14, No. 1(1967), pp. 35-40.

[9] Arthur W. Combs, and Daniel W. Soper, "The Perceptual Organization of Effective Counselors," Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 10, No. 3 (1963), pp. 222-226.

[10] Carl R. Rogers, "The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change," Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 21 (1957), pp. 95-103.

[11] Irene E. Waskow, "Counselor Attitudes and Client Behavior," Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 27, No. 5 (1963), pp. 405-412.

[12] Charles B. Truax, "Effective Ingredients in Psychotherapy: An Approach to Unraveling the Patient-Therapist Interaction," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (1963), pp. 256-263.

[13] Charles B. Truax, and Robert R. Carkhuff, "Client and Therapist Transparency in the Psychotherapeutic Encounter," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (1965), pp. 3-9.

[14] Robert R. Carkhuff, and Mae Alexik, "Effect of Client Depth of Self-exploration Upon High- and Low-functioning Counselors," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (1967), pp. 350-355.

[15] Daniel Kratochvil, David Aspy, and Robert Carkhuff, "The Differential Effects of Absolute Level and Direction of Growth in Counselor Functioning Upon Client Level of Functioning," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (1967), pp. 216-217.

[16] Herman Feifel, and Janet Eells, "Patients and Therapists Assess the Same Psychotherapy," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (1963), pp. 310-318.

[17] Francis A. Board, "Patients and Physician's Judgments of Outcome of Psychotherapy in an Outpatient Clinic," *A.M.A Archives of General Psychiatry*, 1 (1959), pp. 188-196.

[18] Harry J. Canon, "Personality Variables and Counselor-Client Affect," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (1964), pp. 35-41.

[19] William U. Snyder, *The Psychotherapy Relationship*, New York: Macmillan, 1961.

[20] Canon, *op.cit.*, p. 40.

[21] Canon, *Ibid.*, p. 40.

[22] G. T. Barrett-Lennard, "Dimensions of Therapist Response as Causal Factors in Therapeutic Change," *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, Vol. 76, No. 43 (1962), p. 562.

[23] Barrett-Lennard, *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

[24] Barrett-Lennard, *Ibid.*, p. 22.

[25] F. E. Fiedler, "A Comparison of Therapeutic Relationships in Psychoanalytic, Non-directive, and Adlerian Psychotherapy, *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 14 (1950), pp. 436-445.

[26] O. H. Bown, *An Investigation of Therapeutic Relationships in Client-Centered Psychotherapy*, (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago), 1954.

[27] Bown, *Ibid*., p. 43.

[28] Carl R. Rogers, "The Therapeutic Relationship: Recent Theory and Research," *Australian Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1965), pp. 95-108.

[29] Carl R. Rogers, "The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21 (1957), pp. 95-103.

[30] Rogers, *op.cit*., *Australian Journal of Psychology* (1965).

[31] Eugene W. Schoch, "Practicum Counselor's Behavioral Changes," *Counselor Education and Supervision*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1966), pp. 57-62.

[32] Arthur W. Comb, and Daniel W. Soper, "The Perceptual Organization of Effective Counselors," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 10 (Fall, 1963), pp. 222-226.

[33] Gloria J. Lewis, *op.cit*., doctoral dissertation.

[34] Schoch, *op.cit*., p. 57.

[35] Schoch, *op.cit*., p. 57.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter outlines Lewis's research as an antecedent to this present effort, describes the client and counselor population, the instruments used, and the procedures of the experiment.

I. LEWIS'S STUDY

The subjects for Lewis's study were 28 graduate students enrolled in the winter quarter Counseling Practicum course at Northwestern University during the 1967-68 school year. They were randomly divided into two groups of 14 each. Both were considered to be experimental groups. Both groups were learning counseling by methods based upon valid sources of counseling knowledge. As previously mentioned, _Group I_ experienced the _experiential-introspective_ approach, and _Group II_ experienced the _didactic-behavioristic_ approach. The conditions of learning in _Group I_ involved providing an atmosphere most conducive to nurturing self-development and self-analysis. Experiences were provided that were thought to be most likely to facilitate such growth. The conditions of learning in _Group II_ involved reinforcement of student performance in a didactic manner, and learning through role-modeling. Lectures, films, tapes, and observations of others were offered to this group in an attempt to have them be "learning from others," while _Group I_ was "learning from self."

II. POPULATION

The counselor sample for Lewis's study has already been described. However, the counselor sample for this study consisted only of those of her subjects who continued in the Supervised Experience course the following quarter. Therefore, some further delineation of counselor as well as client population is now necessary.

Counselor Population

Lewis studied counselor attitudinal changes during participation in a practicum. This present effort is concerned with the following questions: How do the student counselors in her study function when actually working with counselees? Are there differential perceptions of counseling sessions following these two methods of training? Those practicum participants who continued in the Spring Supervised Experience were the subjects for this present study. This group consisted of 20 of the original 28, 11 from Group I, and 9 from Group II. The mean age for Group I counselors was 27.9, and the age range was 22 to 56. The mean age for Group II counselors was 27.2, and the age range was 22 to 43. There were 3 men and 8 women in Group I, and 3 men and 6 women in Group II. Three women in each group were married. Nine of the 11 Group I counselors and 9 of 9 Group II counselors were Master's degree candidates. The descriptive data for these 20 counselors is summarized in Table I.

Counselee Population

The counselees for this study consisted of all students seen in initial interviews by the 20 counselors in the study population. There were 42 male and 30 female clients in Group I, and 35 male and 26 female clients in Group II. There were 133 initial sessions that were subsequently analyzed. Of these, 72 were with Group I counselors, and 61 were with Group II counselors. The mean age for Group I clients

TABLE I

COUNSELOR SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

	GROUP I	GROUP II
Number	11	9
Age		
Mean	27.9	27.2
Range	22-56	22-43
Sex		
Male	3 (27%)	3 (33%)
Female	8 (73%)	6 (67%)
Marital Status		
Married	3 (27%)	3 (33%)
Single	8 (73%)	6 (67%)
Educational Level		
Master's candidates	9 (82%)	9 (100%)
Post-Master's	1 (9%)	
Special Students	1 (9%)	

was 16.8, and the age range was 9 to 23. The mean age for Group II was 16.5, and the age range was 9 to 19. One Group I client and 2 Group II clients were at the elementary school level. Sixteen Group I clients and 12 Group II clients were college level students. The remaining majority of clients, 55 in Group I and 47 in Group II, were high school juniors. The descriptive data for the 133 clients is summarized in Table II.

TABLE II

CLIENT SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

	GROUP I	GROUP II
Number	72	61
Age		
Mean	16.8	16.5
Range	9-23	9-19
Sex		
Male	42 (58.3%)	35 (57.4%)
Female	30 (41.7%)	26 (42.6%)
Educational Level		
Elementary	1 (1.4%)	2 (3.3%)
Secondary	55 (76.4%)	47 (77%)
College	16 (22.2%)	12 (19.7%)

III. INSTRUMENTS

Orlinsky and Howard[1] developed two parallel questionnaires to survey the experiences of patients and therapists during psychotherapy sessions. The questions are directed to the behavior and experiences of the patient and therapist, and to certain qualities of the patient-therapist interaction. Each participant answers questions about himself, about the other person, and about their relationship in the particular session.

For this present study, Orlinsky and Howard's instruments: Therapy Session Report, Form P (patient) and Form T (therapist) were slightly revised to apply to counseling in a school setting rather than clinical use. All references to psychotherapy were changed to refer to counseling, and the title was revised to Counseling Session Report, Form Co (counselor) and Form Cee (counselee).[2] In all other respects, the Counseling Session Reports are identical to the original instrument.

Orlinsky and Howard[3] report that the original instruments were extensively pilot-tested and revised before choices of items were made for inclusion in the final version of the Therapy Session Report. The final forms represented two years of work in development and have been used in preliminary forms in nearly two thousand reports of psychotherapy sessions. The Counseling Session Reports used in this present study are identical in form, design, and purpose to the original instruments developed by Orlinsky and Howard. The revised instruments were pilot-tested prior to use in the Spring Supervised Experience to further establish their equality.

The two forms are divided into 11 sets of questions. The following presents a brief description of the types of questions included in each section of the questionnaires.[4]

Section One:

Both participants evaluate the overall quality of the counseling session.

Section Two:

Each participant is presented with a list of 19 topics commonly discussed in sessions, and is asked to indicate how much the counselee talked about each topic during the session. This provides a measure of session content.

Section Three:

Counselors and clients rate the degree of expectation of the client for a number of specific aims possible in the counseling session. There are 14 such client goals listed.

Section Four:

Both participants respond to a list of 12 disturbing concerns that might occupy a client during a session. They are asked to indicate the extent to which the client was concerned with each of these.

Section Five:

Responses are elicited to a list of 30 common feelings which clients might experience during a counseling session. Both participants are asked to indicate the degree to which the client seemed to experience each feeling.

Section Six:

This section concerns the character of the client's participation in the session. Two levels of participation--behavioral and experiental--are surveyed. At the behavioral level, questions are asked which reveal something about the manner or style of the client's overt relating to the counselor: his initiative and receptivity; his dominance or submissiveness; his friendliness or hostility; his verbal and emotional responsiveness. At the experiential level, client and counselor are asked questions directed towards the client's subjective participation in the session: his associative and affective productivity; his cognizance and coherence of experience; his spontaneity and sense of self-control; and his self-esteem.

Section Seven:

Included here are questions regarding motivation for counseling, progress, and well-being. The items refer to the client, and are responded to by both participants.

Section Eight:

The counselor is asked to indicate the direction of his interventions with the client during the session. A list of objectives toward which a counselor might work is provided, and the counselor indicates the degree to which he sought each of these ends. The client is asked to indicate what goals he felt were accomplished in the session. A list of possible satisfactions is given, and the client indicates the degree to which each was realized by him during the session.

Section Nine:

The client is asked to indicate the degree of understanding and helpfulness of his counselor during the session. The counselor is also asked to evaluate his understanding of and helpfulness to the client. In addition to this, the counselor is asked to indicate his motivation for the session, his rapport with the client, his openness with the client, and degree to which his own state of mind interfered with his counseling efforts.

Section Ten:

Here, clients and counselors respond to a set of questions about the behavioral and interpersonal participation of the counselor in the session. This corresponds to Section Six, where clients and counselors responded regarding the behavioral and interpersonal participation of the clients.

Section Eleven:

Here both participants are asked to indicate the degree to which the counselors seemed to have certain feelings. This corresponds to Section Six, where clients and counselors responded to a similar list of feelings, indicating the degree to which the clients experienced them.

IV. PROCEDURES

Identification of Counselor Population

Possible subjects for this study were all students enrolled in the winter quarter practicum in counseling at Northwestern University during the 1967-68 school year. Since the investigation was to take place during the spring quarter, the first step of the study was to identify the number of students who had taken the practicum that were subsequently enrolled in the Supervised Experience course. There were 28 students in the winter quarter practicum, and 22 of them had enrolled in the Spring Supervised Counseling Experience. Of these 22, 12 had been in the experiential-introspective group, and 10 had been in the didactic-behavioristic group. Two persons, one from each group, were eliminated from the study. They had worked exclusively with primary school age children who were unable to respond to the questionnaire.

Orientation of Counselors

At the first class meeting of the Spring Supervised Experience, the participating counselors were given a description of the project. The counselors were told that they would be expected to complete a questionnaire immediately following each interview, and they were told to have their counselees do the same. After the first day of counseling sessions, several of the directions were revised. New directions instructed the counselors to remain in the interview rooms to respond to the questionnaires. The counselees returned to the room where earlier testing had taken place to record their responses. Subsequently, all questionnaires were filled out individually and confidentially immediately following the interviews.

Directions regarding the handling of the questionnaires were presented to the counselors and their supervisors via several short class presentations. This was all done prior to the use of the instruments. The instructions (see Appendix C) were passed out to further insure standardization. The directions are self-explanatory, and they include specific directions regarding the handling of the questionnaires. The only directions that were changed are those noted in the above section: counselors, rather than clients, used the interview rooms when responding to the questionnaires. This was done to conserve time.

Orientation of Counselees

A supervisor met briefly with the counselees on the morning of their counseling sessions. Counselees were told that they would be expected to fill out a questionnaire following their counseling sessions. They were instructed to respond to the questions immediately following the sessions. They were further told that their answers were strictly confidential, even though this was indicated on the cover of each questionnaire. Honesty and sincerity in responding also was mentioned. Finally, they were told that their responses would be quite useful in evaluating how worthwhile their counseling sessions had been, and in improving the Northwestern counseling program in the future.

Questionnaire Format

The questionnaires, as previously mentioned, were identical in form, design, and purpose to the original Therapy Session Reports of Orlinsky and Howard. Although the body of the questionnaires remained the same, a different cover design was used. The questionnaires were color-coded to decrease the possibilities of mixing forms filled out by counselors with forms filled out by clients. Form Cee (counselee) had a blue cover, and Form Co (counselor) had a yellow cover. Identification data on the cover of the questionnaires consisted of a three part code in letters and numbers, and the date of the interview. The first part of the code was a letter of the alphabet which represented the counselor. The second part was a number which represented the identity of the counselee. The third part was a number representing the session number. For example, B-3-1 would identify counselor B's first session with his third client.

Data Analysis

When all the data had been gathered, representing initial counseling sessions with the 133 students described as the counselee population, the information was transferred to IBM punch cards. A computer program written by Dr. Janos Koplyay of Northwestern University was used.[5] With minor modifications, this program was found to be quite applicable to the data and the problem. In relation to the specific hypotheses listed in Chapter I, the operation involved was the statistical analysis of the mean responses of Group I and Group II counselors and clients in order to discover any statistically significant differences. The test of statistical significance used was the following:[6]

$$t = \frac{/\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2/ - K}{\sqrt{\frac{X_1^2 + X_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2}\left(\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2}\right)}}$$

Differential practicum training was the independent variable in the experimental design. Counselees who saw counselors from either group were randomly chosen from the same general population and considered to be equal. Data in Table II lends further strength to this assumption.

Significant differences in item responses found in the analysis are examined in light of the differences in practicum training.

Summary

The procedures of this study involved the analysis of initial counseling session made by two groups of student counselors following differential practicum experiences. The counselors were enrollees in

Supervised Experience in Counseling, and the counselees were self-referred school-age clients. Both counselors and counselees responded to questionnaires immediately following their initial counseling sessions. An examination of these responses was conducted to establish if any differences existed between mean responses of Group I and Group II counselors and their clients. Four separate analyses were performed: Group I counselors were compared to Group II counselors. Group I counselees were compared to Group II counselees. Group I counselors were compared to their own counselees. And, Group II counselors were compared to their own counselees. Significant differences were then evaluated in light of the differential practicum experiences of the counselors.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Orlinsky and Howard, IJR Research Report, Vol. 3, No. 8 (1966).

[2] Appendices A and B.

[3] Orlinsky and Howard, *op.cit.*, p. 7.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 4-7.

[5] Janos Koplyay, "Gloria," (name of program).

[6] Merle W. Tate, *Statistics in Education & Psychology*, New York: MacMillan, 1965, p. 284.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Results of the statistical analyses are presented in this chapter. Tables XXVII and XXVIII at the end of this thesis present the mean responses of Group I and Group II counselors and clients for each of the items in the questionnaires. The appropriate degrees of freedom are also listed, as well as the resultant "t" scores and their level of significance. In this chapter, unless otherwise noted, only those items which yielded significant differences will be discussed. The reader is referred to Tables XXVII and XXVIII for information on items which did not yield significant results. Also for further reference, the actual questionnaires used in this study are reproduced as Appendices A and B.

In the following presentation of the results, tables will present the significant data, the significant items will be described, the particular results delineated, and the differences explained. The reader is referred to the appendices for the exact wording of any items, and to the tables for any specific mean scores or "t" values where the differences were not significant at the .05 level or beyond.

Four separate analyses were performed. One analysis was performed to test each of the four hypotheses listed in Chapter I. The following sections will present results relevant to each hypothesis independently. Conclusions will follow the presentation of the results.

I. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUP I AND GROUP II COUNSELEES

Hypothesis 1. -- There are no differences between mean responses of the counselees in the two groups.

Relatively few variables (6) were found to have significantly different means for the two groups of counselees.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF GROUP I AND GROUP II COUNSELEES

ITEM	GRP I $\bar{X}$	GRP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
4	.93	.69	130	2.53*
50	1.21	1.42	128	1.97*
85	1.21	.88	128	2.18*
88	.54	.90	127	2.19*
119	1.82	2.08	129	2.52*
152	1.13	.82	128	2.55*

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond

On item 4, Group I counselees reported talking more about brothers and sisters than did Group II counselees. Data was not gathered relative to number of siblings, so no generalizations are possible from this particular finding. When asked to report their feelings during the session, Group I counselees reported feeling less confident than Group II counselees (item 50). More effective counseling involves greater self-analysis, not always a pleasant task, which could result in some loss of confidence. Therefore, this result may be viewed as positive regarding the effectiveness of Group I counselors.

Several other significant results lend support to this conclusion. On item 85: "How much were your feelings stirred up?" Group I clients reported their feelings more stirred up than Group II clients. Stirring up the emotions of a counselee seems a desirable outcome of successful counseling. When responding to item 88: "How much did you have trouble thinking of things to talk about?" Group I counselees reported having less trouble. Although feeling less confident, the Group I counselees, as indicated by these responses, did not feel afraid, or feel unable to communicate.

Item 119 is most important to the purposes of this study. The item reads: "How well did your counselor seem to understand what you were feeling and thinking this session?" Group I clients rated their counselors higher on this item. This indicates that they perceived their counselors as significantly more understanding of their feelings and thoughts. Also of importance is item 152. In this case, counselees responded according to how much they thought their counselors felt the emotion of "closeness" to the clients. The item read: "How close to you did your counselor seem to feel during this session?" The significant difference between means for items 119 and 152 indicates that the Group I counselees did perceive their counselors as better attuned to their feelings and desires.

From these results, there is definite reason to believe that the two groups of clients perceived their counseling sessions differently. On some items, Group I counselees not only responded differently, but consistently in the direction of more effective counseling sessions. There are differences between the two groups of clients in their responses to the questionnaires, and the direction of the difference consistently favors the Group I counselors. They were more positively perceived by their clients in relation to criterion for good counseling sessions. On the basis of these findings, hypothesis 1 is tentatively rejected.

II. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUP I AND GROUP II COUNSELORS

Hypothesis 2. -- There are no differences between mean responses of the counselors in the two groups.

The counselors in the two groups were found to differ significantly on eight of the items on the questionnaires.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES
OF GROUP I AND GROUP II COUNSELORS

ITEM	GRP I $\bar{X}$	GRP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
14	.53	.82	107	2.19*
18	1.14	1.49	108	2.10*
47	.05	.20	108	2.16*
54	.37	.16	108	2.12*
59	.25	.04	108	2.62**
62	.44	.22	108	2.03*
124	.24	.06	108	2.27*
149	.17	.04	107	2.02*

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

Regarding topics of dialogue, Group II counselors reported talking more about money (item 14). The mean response of Group I counselors was also significantly lower than that of either counselee group, which negates any broader significance for this item. Group II counselors also reported talking more about item 18: "Hobbies and interests, play, part-time jobs, leisure time activities." Counselor-counselee comparisons for both groups were not significant; it seems possible that Group I sessions simply alluded to this topic to a lesser extent.

Regarding counselee problems, Group II clients reported more concern about fearful or panicky experiences (item 47).

Regarding perceptions of counselee feelings by counselors, several items yielded significant differences. On item 54: "My counselee seemed to feel--helpless," Group I counselors saw their counselees as feeling more helpless. On this particular item, Group I counselors seemed to be less perceptive than Group II counselors, as Group I counselor responses also differed significantly from those of their own clients. On items 59 and 62, Group I counselors reported their clients as feeling more impatient, and more inadequate. This perception of inadequacy on the part of the Group I counselors is related to several of the previously reported results comparing counselee responses. Group I counselees reported themselves as feeling less confident and having their feelings stirred up more. This seems to have been perceived by Group I counselors as a feeling of inadequacy, possibly coupled with some feelings of impatience.

On item 124: "How much were you critical or disapproving toward your counselee?", Group I counselors reported being more disapproving. Since counselee perceptions of counselor disapproval did not differ, the Group I counselors' responses point to their being somewhat more self-critical than others are of them. This is explainable in terms of their practicum experiences--which involved a good deal of self-analysis. Also related to a more self-critical attitude, Group I counselors responded to item 149: "feeling distracted," more than did Group II counselors. They also responded to item 152: "feeling close to their counselee," less than did Group II counselors. This particular result is of further importance, since Group I counselees rated their counselors closer to them, while Group II counselees rated their counselors as significantly less close.

These results show that the two groups of counselors did perceive their counseling sessions somewhat differently. Group I counselors saw their clients as feeling more helpless, impatient, and inadequate. They reported themselves as more critical or disapproving, more distracted, and less close to their clients. Alone, these would be considered negative elements. However, when related to the responses of the counselees to the same items, the indication is that a cause of this self-critical attitude on the part of Group I counselors might have been the experiential-introspective practicum training. Irrespective of proof of causation, it can be reported that differences did exist between the two groups of counselors. Therefore, hypothesis 2 is tentatively rejected.

III. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUP I COUNSELORS AND COUNSELEES

Hypothesis 3. -- There are no differences between mean responses of Group I (experiential-introspective) counselors and their counselees.

Group I counselors and their clients differed significantly in their responses to the following 47 relevant items on the questionnaires. This presentation of results will follow the format of the questionnaires, with the material divided into sections to correspond to the sections of the instruments.

Section One:

TABLE V

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION ONE

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
1	2.65	3.59	128	3.41**

** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

When asked to evaluate the quality of the counseling session, Group I counselees rated the sessions higher than did their counselors. Client ratings were, on the average, between "very good" and "excellent." Counselor ratings were between "very good" and "pretty good."

Section Two:

TABLE VI

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION TWO

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
14	.80	.53	125	2.21*

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond

Regarding topics of discussion, Group I counselors and clients differed only on item 14.

Group I counselors reported talking less about money. This difference has been pointed out in a previous section and remains unexplainable in terms of the purposes of this particular project.

Section Three:

TABLE VII

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION THREE

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
24	.74	.44	127	2.50*
26	.67	.39	127	2.31*
27	.33	.68	127	2.96**
28	.57	.12	127	4.45** +
29	1.29	.64	127	4.68**
30	1.50	1.07	127	3.03**
31	1.08	.78	128	2.33*
32	.40	.14	127	2.88**
33	.23	.66	127	4.09** +
35	.96	.64.	127	2.36*

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond
+ = questions were not parallel across Co and Cee forms

Clients reported being more concerned with the following goals:

Item 24 -- Help in dealing with anxiety arousing concerns.

Item 26 -- Better understanding of reasons for problematic feelings or behavior.

Item 29 -- To explore emergent feelings and experiences.

Item 30 -- Advice about making some specific goals.

Item 31 -- To be treated as a friend.

Item 32 -- To get better self-control.

Item 35 -- To get the counselor's frank opinion or evaluation.

Clients reported being less concerned than their counselors about the following goal:

Item 27 -- Getting reassurance or approval from the counselor.

Generally, the counselors felt that their counselees wanted freedom to say what they felt, some relief from their concerns, and reassurance from the counselor. The clients, although they desired these goals, did not indicate their preferences as strongly as the counselors. The clients seemed more concerned with a greater variety of goals than their counselors had given them credit for.

Section Four:

TABLE VIII

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION FOUR

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
43	.69	.37	127	2.43*
47	.27	.05	127	2.62**

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

This section lists 12 possible concerns of the client. The clients rated themselves as more concerned about expressing themselves to others (item 43), and more concerned about fearful or panicky experiences (item 47). The indication here is that Group I counselors demonstrated a better ability to understand the concerns of their clients, for Group II counselors "misread" their clients on twice as many variables in this section.

Section Five:

TABLE IX

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION FIVE

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
51	.24	.56	127	2.92**
54	.17	.37	127	2.09*
55	.06	.19	127	2.12*
56	1.31	.85	128	3.41**
57	.79	.39	127	3.29**
67	.20	.76	126	5.04**
68	1.46	1.17	126	2.11*
71	1.34	.98	127	2.58**
73	.09	.29	126	2.56*
75	.20	.42	126	2.21*
76	1.26	.97	126	2.20*
77	.29	.10	126	2.18*
79	.23	.03	126	2.78**

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

This section lists 30 possible feelings of the counselee. Counselees reported feeling more ~~stubborn (item 55)~~, grateful (item 56), relieved (item 57), ~~affectionate (item 67)~~, serious (item 68), pleased (item 71), hopeful (item 76), tired (item 77), and thirsty (item 79). Their counselors indicated these feelings for their clients to a significantly lesser extent. The counselees reported they felt less embarrassed (item 51 helpless (item 54), stubborn (item 55), affectionate (item 67) discouraged (item 73), and frustrated (item 75). Their counselors perceived them as feeling more of these particular emotion

Section Six:

TABLE X

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION SIX

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
89	2.41	1.86	128	3.20**
90	2.01	1.49	127	2.75**
92	2.57	1.76	125	4.46**
93	2.17	1.61	126	3.54**

** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

The character of the counselee's participation in the session is explored in this section.

The Group I clients felt that they were warmer and friendlier to their counselors than was perceived by the counselors (item 89). The clients also felt more spontaneous than as perceived by the counselors (item 90). The clients also felt that they were more attentive, and more accepting of the counselor's point of view than they were perceived to be by the counselors (items 92 and 93). As will be indicated in the fourth section of this chapter, the same results occurred when comparing Group II counselors and clients.

Section Seven:

TABLE XI

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION SEVEN

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
97	2.15	2.63	125	2.08*
98	2.41	3.00	125	2.48*

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond

Included in this section are several items related to motivation for counseling, progress, and client well-being.

Group I clients reported feeling more motivated for counseling than as perceived by their counselors (item 97). They also reported feeling that they had made more progress than as judged by the counselors (item 98).

Section Eight:

TABLE XII

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION EIGHT

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
102	1.15	1.85	128	4.89** +
103	1.01	1.92	128	5.96**
105	.50	.90	127	3.00**
108	.99	.71	127	2.12*
109	1.27	.66	127	4.53**
110	1.39	1.85	127	3.28**

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond
+ = questions were not parallel across Co and Cee forms

In this section, counselors indicated the directions toward which they were working, and counselees indicated what they felt they had gained from the session.

Group I counselors reported working more toward the following directions that their clients reported feeling these directions as being reached:

Item 103 -- Talking about concerns.

Item 105 -- Understanding the reasons behind actions.

Item 110 -- Establishing a genuine person-to-person relationship.

On the other hand, Group I clients felt they got much more advice about making some specific goals than was perceived by their counselors (item 109). Their counselors reacted to a much lesser extent when indicating to how great an extent they were working toward helping the counselee explore new ways of dealing with self and others (item 102). Also, Group I clients reported more ability to recognize feelings than their counselors reported working toward this goal (item 108).

Section Nine:

TABLE XIII

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION NINE

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
119	1.82	2.05	128	1.32
120	2.17	3.58	127	5.02**

** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

In the ninth section of the questionnaires, two items are comparable for counselor-client pairs. On the first, item 119, regarding how well the counselor understood the counselee's feelings and thoughts, no differences existed between Group I counselors and their clients. Significantly, in relation to the premises of this study, the same was not true in Group II. This will be further delineated in the fourth section of this chapter. The second item, 120, referred to how helpful both counselor and client felt the counselor had been. The clients felt the counselors had been more helpful than the counselors had judged themselves as being.

Section Ten:

TABLE XIV

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION TEN

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
123	2.35	2.00	128	2.18*
125	1.97	1.46	127	3.12**

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

The eight items in this section have to do with the counselor's interpersonal behavior.

Group I clients felt their counselors accepted their ideas and points of view more than the counselors themselves felt they had (item 123). Group I clients also felt their counselors took the initiative in defining the issues to be talked about more than the counselors felt they had done this (item 125).

Section Eleven:

TABLE XV

GROUP I RESPONSES TO SECTION ELEVEN

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
130	1.65	1.24	127	3.21**
133	.80	1.14	126	2.28*
134	1.70	1.43	127	2.01*

TABLE XV (CONTINUED)

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
135	.03	.43	127	4.78**
139	.49	.19	125	2.65**
141	.07	.28	126	2.68**
147	.12	.33	125	2.64**
152	1.13	.74	126	2.94**

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

This final part of the questionnaires explores counselor and client perceptions of counselor feelings during the session. In comparison to their clients' perceptions of counselor feelings, Group I counselors reported feeling more sympathetic (item 133), frustrated (item 135), perplexed (item 141), and unsure (item 147). The counselors reported feeling less thoughtful (item 130), less cheerful (item 134), less apprehensive (item 139), and less close (emotionally) than as perceived by their clients (item 152).

These results indicate that Group I counselors and their counselees did perceive their counseling sessions differently. Generally, the counselees' responses were more positive regarding the session than were the counselors'. The counselees rated the overall quality of the session higher than did the counselors; they reported being concerned with a greater variety of goals; and they tended to see themselves as less helpless in the counseling session than as perceived by their counselors. They felt more motivated for counseling, reported having made more progress than as perceived by their counselors, and felt the counselors had been more helpful than the counselors had judged themselves as being. Finally, Group I counselors reported feeling more sympathetic, frustrated, perplexed, and unsure than as perceived by their clients, and less thoughtful, cheerful, apprehensive, and emotionally close. The counselors seemed to convey some apprehensiveness to their clients, but felt much more unsure of themselves than as perceived by the clients. The clients seemed to sense some emotional closeness and involvement on the part of the counselors, which furthered their trust and confidence.

On the basis of these results, it can be reported that differences did exist between Group I counselors and their clients. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 is tentatively rejected.

IV. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUP II COUNSELORS AND COUNSELEES

Hypothesis 4. -- There are no differences between mean responses of Group II (didactic-behavioristic) counselors and their counselees.

Group II counselors and their clients differed significantly in their responses to the following 40 relevant items on the questionnaires. The results are presented in the same format as those in part III of this chapter, which presented results for Hypothesis 3.

Section One:

TABLE XVI

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION ONE

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
1	2.67	3.47	109	2.84**

** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

Group II counselors, like Group I counselors, consistently rated the counseling sessions as poorer than did their counselees. The clients were more positive in their ratings.

Section Two:

TABLE XVII

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION TWO

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
6	1.56	1.29	110	1.97*
21	.48	.08	110	3.14**

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

Regarding subjects talked about, Group II counselors and clients differed on two items.

The counselors reported talking less about school work and classroom activities than did their counselees (item 6), and they also responded less often to item 21: "other" than did their counselees. Responses to item 21 are especially relevant to this analysis, since Group I counselors filled in the blank space three times as frequently as Group II counselors. Group I counselors and clients did not differ significantly on this item.

Section Three:

The results for Group II counselors and clients is almost identical to the results for Group I.

TABLE XVIII

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION THREE

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
23	.95	.68	109	2.04*
24	.75	.46	109	2.23*
26	.56	.30	109	2.16*
27	.31	.84	109	4.03**
28	.67	.16	109	4.52** +
29	1.25	.58	109	4.82**
30	1.57	1.20	109	2.72**
31	1.03	.72	109	2.34*
32	.46	.18	109	2.59**
35	1.12	.68	108	2.89**

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond
+ = questions were not parallel across Co and Cee forms

Group II clients reported being more concerned about the following goals:

Item 23 -- Learn more about what to do in counseling and what to expect from it.

Item 24 -- Help in dealing with anxiety arousing concerns.

Item 26 -- Better understanding of reasons for problematic feelings or behavior

Item 29 -- To explore emergent feelings and experiences.

Item 30 -- Get advice about making some specific goals.

Item 31 -- To be treated as a friend.

Item 32 -- To get better self-control.

Item 35 -- To get the counselor's frank opinion or evaluation.

Clients reported being less concerned than their counselors about the following goals:

Item 27 -- Getting reasurance or approval from the counselor.

Section Four:

TABLE XIX

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION FOUR

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
38	1.12	.73	109	2.80**
40	.33	.10	109	2.44*
43	.93	.55	109	2.59**
48	.27	.08	109	2.22*

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

This section listed possible client concerns.

Group I clients rated themselves as more concerned about fearful or panicky experiences. Their counselors' mean ratings of them were significantly lower on these two concerns. Group II counselors "misread" their clients on four of the twelve items in this section. Group II counselees rated themselves as more concerned about the following variables:

Item 38 -- Meeting obligations and responsibilities.

Item 40 -- Living up to the demands of conscience: shameful or guilty feelings.

Item 43 -- Expressing oneself to others.

Item 48 -- Meaning little or nothing to others; being worthless or unlovable.

It appears that Group II counselors, and to a lesser extent, Group I counselors, underemphasize the intensity of counselee concerns. In some cases, it appears that they may not even recognize the concern.

Section Five:

TABLE XX

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION FIVE

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
56	1.19	.75	108	3.18**
61	.37	.14	108	2.41*
67	.25	.52	107	2.30*
71	1.32	1.04	107	2.02*
76	1.19	.88	107	2.25*
77	.22	.04	107	2.28*
79	.29	.02	107	3.13**

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

This section lists 30 possible feelings of the counselee.

Counselees in Group II reported feeling more grateful (item 56), strange (item 61), pleased (item 71), hopeful (item 76), tired (item 77), and thirsty (item 79) than as perceived by their counselors. Counselees reported feeling less affectionate (item 67) than as perceived by their counselors.

Section Six:

Here, the character of the counselee's participation in the session is explored.

TABLE XXI

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION SIX

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
89	2.31	1.78	108	3.10**
92	2.50	2.12	109	2.08*
93	2.22	1.88	109	2.03*

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

The Group II differences are similar to those found in Group I. Group II counselees felt that they were warmer and friendlier to their counselors (item 89), that they were more attentive (item 92), and more accepting of the counselor's point of view than as perceived by the counselors (item 93). Of importance here is that Group I counselees rated themselves as "more spontaneous", "saying things as they came to mind."

Section Seven:

TABLE XXII

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION SEVEN

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
98	2.47	2.94	108	2.06*

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond

Client motivation for counseling, progress, and present well-being is examined in this section.

Group II clients, like Group I clients, indicated that they felt they had made more progress in the counseling session than as perceived by their counselors (item 98).

Section Eight:

TABLE XXIII

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION EIGHT

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
102	1.17	1.88	109	4.89**
103	.83	1.86	109	7.07**
108	.95	.61	109	2.39*
109	1.23	.41	109	6.00**
110	1.32	1.65	109	2.31*

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

Here, counselors indicated the directions toward which they were working, and counselees indicated what they felt they had gained from the session.

Group II counselors reported working toward the following directions more than as perceived by their clients:

Item 102 -- Understanding client concerns.

Item 103 -- Helping the counselee talk about his concerns.

Item 110 -- Establishing a genuine person-to-person relationship.

Group II clients felt they received more advice about making some specific goals (item 109) than as perceived by their counselors. Also, Group II counselees reported more ability to recognize feelings and desires (item 108) than their counselors reported working toward this goal.

Section Nine:

TABLE XXIV

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION NINE

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
119	2.08	2.55	109	2.34*
120	2.22	3.57	109	5.20**

* = "t" value is significant at .05 level or beyond
** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

On item 119, regarding how well the counselor understood the client's feelings and thoughts, Group II clients were more positive in their ratings of their counselors than the counselors were of themselves. This takes on added significance because differences did not exist between Group I counselors and their clients; but Group I counselees did rate their counselors as more understanding of their feelings and thoughts, and Group I counselors rated themselves as somewhat more understanding than Group II counselors, with the results approaching significance. The results indicate that Group I counselors perceived themselves as more understanding, and this is born out by their clients' higher ratings of them on this item. Regarding item 120, Group II clients, like Group I clients, rated their counselors as having been more helpful than the counselors themselves felt they had been.

Section Ten:

TABLE XXV

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION TEN

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
125	2.05	1.47	109	3.36**

** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

The items in this section refer to the counselor's interpersonal behavior in the session.

Group II clients felt their counselors took the initiative in defining the issues to be talked about more than the counselors themselves indicated that they had done this (item 125).

Section Eleven:

TABLE XXVI

GROUP II RESPONSES TO SECTION ELEVEN

ITEM	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
130	1.82	1.43	109	3.01**
134	1.77	1.37	109	3.10**
135	.03	.27	108	3.01**
140	1.37	1.06	108	2.59**
147	.07	.39	108	4.22**

** = "t" value is significant at .01 level or beyond

Counselor and client perceptions of counselor feelings during the session are presented in this final section of the questionnaires. In comparison to their clients' perceptions of their feelings, Group II counselors reported feeling more frustrated (item 135) and more unsure (item 147) of themselves. Group II counselors also reported feeling less thoughtful (item 130), less cheerful (item 134), and less effective (item 140) than as perceived by their clients.

These results indicate that Group II counselors and their counselees did perceive their counseling sessions differently. As in Group I, the counselees' responses were more positive regarding the session than were the counselors'. However, there were several differences that were not found in Group I. Group II counselors seemed to underemphasize the intensity and variety of client concerns to a greater extent than Group I counselors. Of specific relevance is that Group II clients rated their counselors as more understanding than the counselors rated themselves. This difference did not exist in Group I. Group I counselors and clients rated counselor understanding higher than did their counterparts Group II, with the results approaching significance. A final result worthy of noting is that Group II counselors felt themselves to be significantly less effective than as perceived by their clients, while this difference did not exist in Group I.

Within the limitations of this study, and on the basis of these results, it can be reported that differences did exist between Group II counselors and their clients. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 is tentatively rejected.

V. SUMMARY

Results of the statistical analyses have been reported in this chapter. Tables have presented the significant data; the significant items have been described; the particular results have been delineated; and the results have been explained. Four separate analyses were performed. One analysis was performed to test each of the four hypotheses listed in Chapter I. The results of the analyses indicated the rejection of all four null hypotheses. Group I clients and counselors were found to perceive the sessions differently from Group II clients and counselors, both in comparison across groups as well as within groups. There is some indication, from the results of this study, that the Group I counselors, trained by the experiential-introspective method, were somewhat better attuned to the wants and needs of their clients, and better able to communicate this understanding to them.

However, although differences in perceptions of initial counseling sessions did exist between these two groups of counselors and their clients, client and counselor ratings of the sessions did not differ across groups. The two groups of counselors and the two groups of clients rated the quality of their counseling sessions comparably. Therefore, these results would indicate that counselor educators should not choose either the experiential-introspective or the didactic-behavioristic method for conducting a practicum. The results of this study have pointed out some valuable elements in both methods of training. Therefore, it seems that elements of both types of training should be incorporated in a practicum to bring about the most successful counseling as perceived by counselors and their clients.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

Problem

Counselor education programs offering master's degrees in counseling and guidance have the expressed task of preparing personnel for schools. The question of how best to train these students is a most important one. The American Personnel and Guidance Association offers a list of six basic qualities found in the effective counselor. A great deal of literature examines the extent to which counselors have these qualities, both before and after practicum training.[1] At the present time, however, there is a lack of information regarding actual counseling behavior following different methods of practicum training. Lewis[2] in her dissertation at Northwestern University, manipulated the practicum experiences of two groups of counselor candidates. The two types of experiences were the experiential-introspective and the didactic-behavioristic approaches. Using a battery of pre- and post-treatment instruments, Lewis examined whether one or the other method of instruction was more effective in terms of positive attitudinal changes. Criterion for effectiveness was represented by the American Personnel and Guidance Association standards previously quoted. One basic question, then, was the concern of Lewis' study: Which of two methods of conducting a practicum brings about the most constructive attitudinal changes in the counselor candidates?

Purpose

This study concerned itself with what was felt to be an equally

APPENDIX A

important subsequent question which grew out of a close association with Lewis' work: Which of these two methods of conducting a practicum brought about more successful counseling as perceived by these counselors and their counselees? Do counselors trained by these two methods behave differentially in actual counseling sessions? Is their behavior perceived differentially by their clients? If there are differences, will counselors trained by the experiential-introspective method or those trained by the didactic-behavioristic method be better attuned to the wants and needs of their counselees and be better able to objectively define these needs? The results of this effort should point to a critical examination of counselor education training programs regarding the most effective methods of conducting a practicum.

Hypotheses

The following specific null hypotheses were tested:

1. There are no differences between mean responses of the counselees in the two groups.

2. There are no differences between mean responses of the counselors in the two groups.

3. There are no differences between mean responses of Group I (experiential-introspective) counselors and their counselees.

4. There are no differences between mean responses of Group II (didactic-behavioristic) counselors and their counselees.

Population

The counselor population consisted of 20 graduate students enrolled in the Supervised Counseling Experience course at Northwestern University during the Spring quarter of the 1967-68 school year. There were 11 counselors in Group I (experiential-introspective), and 9 counselors in Group II (didactic-behavioristic). The counselee population consisted of 133 students seen for initial counseling sessions by the 20 counselors.

Instruments

Orlinsky and Howard[3] have developed two parallel questionnaires to survey the experiences of both patients and therapists during psychotherapy sessions. For this present study, Orlinsky and Howard's instruments: Therapy Session Report, Form P (patient) and Form T (therapist) were slightly revised to apply to counseling in a school setting rather than clinical use. All references to psychotherapy were changed to refer to counseling, and the title was revised to Counseling Session Report, Form Co (counselor) and Form Cee (counselee). In all other respects, the Counseling Session Reports were identical to the original instruments. The revised instruments were pilot-tested prior to use to further establish their equality.

Procedures

The procedures of this study involved the analysis of initial counseling sessions made by two groups of student counselors following differential practicum experiences. The counselors were enrolled in Supervised Experience in Counseling, and the counselees were self-referred school-age clients. The participating counselors were given a description of the project at their first class meeting. Northwestern staff members met briefly with clients prior to their counseling session for a short orientation. Both counselors and counselees responded to the questionnaires immediately following their initial counseling sessions. Identifying information and coded responses were then transferred to IBM punch cards.

In relation to the specific hypotheses of the study, the statistical analysis involved the examination of the mean responses of Group I and Group II counselors and clients to discover any statistically significant differences.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Analyses of these data indicated that: (1) Group I clients differed from Group II clients in some of their perceptions of the counseling sessions; (2) Group I counselors differed from Group II counselors in some of their perceptions of the counseling sessions; (3) Group I counselors differed from their clients in some perceptions of the counseling sessions; and (4) Group II counselors differed from their clients in some perceptions of the counseling sessions. Analyses of the data indicated the rejection of all four null hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1

Although significant differences were found between Group I and Group II counselees on relatively few (6) of the items on the questionnaires, there does seem to be an indication that Group I sessions were rated more positively by the counselees. Group I counselees reported feeling less confident, having their feelings stirred up more, having less trouble thinking of things to talk about, feeling better understood, and feeling "closer" to their counselors. Due to the small number of significant differences, only a few tentative conclusions are in order. The two groups of clients did, indeed, differ in their perceptions of the sessions, the Group I clients felt more fluent, more emotional, and better understood by their counselors. This suggests that the introspective method of practicum training was somewhat more effective in fostering an affective relationship between counselor and client. The clients in Group I perceived their counselors as more understanding and "closer" to them. The introspective training had fostered understanding as a specific goal, and this seems to have been realized.

Hypothesis 2

Group I and Group II counselors differed in their responses to 8 of the items on the questionnaire. Group I counselors saw their clients as feeling more helpless, impatient and inadequate. They reported themselves as more critical or disapproving, more distracted, and less close to their clients. When related to the response patterns of their clients, these results indicate a somewhat self-critical attitude on the part of Group I counselors. Again, a tentative conclusion is offered that the Group I training, with its emphasis on self-analysis and introspection, may well have fostered this self-critical attitude.

Hypotheses 3 and 4

Both Group I and Group II clients and counselors differed in their responses to many of the items on the questionnaires, (47 and 40). The results for hypothesis 1 indicates that Group I and Group II clients differed in their perceptions of the sessions on only 6 variables. The results for hypothesis 2 indicates that Group I and Group II counselors differed in their perceptions of the sessions on only 8 variables. An interesting conclusion can be drawn from these results. It appears that the two groups of clients, actually from the same population except for the particular counselor they had seen, had a fairly clear picture in their minds as to the purpose and process of counseling. Whether their perceptions were valid or not is not important here, what is important is that students from four different institutions, three high schools and one college, had generally similar perceptions of their counseling sessions. It seems that for these students some stereotyped picture of the counselor exists.

The same results hold true for the two groups of counselors. They, too, seem to have some stereotyped views of clients, regardless of their previous training or background. The two groups of counselors differed on only 8 variables when compared to each other, but differed on many variables (47 and 40) when compared to their own clients. The writer would conclude here that both clients and counselors have somewhat inaccurate stereotyped views of counselors, counselees, and counseling. Clients put up a fairly united front in perceptions of sessions, and so do counselors -- but, when analyses of sessions are compared between counselors and their own clients, many differences exist.

Based on analyses of the data relative to the four hypotheses and within the limitations of the study, the following additional conclusions seem warranted:

First, both the experiential-introspective training of Group I and the didactic-behavioristic training of Group II seem to have had an effect on the subsequent counseling efforts of the practicum participants.

Although significant differences did exist in favor of Group I counselors in certain ratings by clients, global ratings of the sessions did not differ. In other words, the conclusion can be drawn that the clients did not differ in their opinions regarding the quality of the sessions regardless of the counselor's training.

This suggests that both methods of practicum training had strengths. Students in both groups were deprived of valuable experiences encountered by the other group. Therefore, an additional conclusion is that elements of both methods of training are necessary in order to bring about the most successful counseling, as perceived by counselors and their clients.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The design and procedures of this study, as well as the results, suggest several recommendations to counselors and counselor educators, especially those engaged in the training of guidance personnel. Several recommendations are particularly important regarding any future research on the process of counseling that might be generated by efforts such as this present one. Other recommendations that have been drawn from the study pertain specifically to effective methods of counselor training.

Recommendations

First, the study should be replicated with a greater number of counselors at more than one institution. In this way the findings could be generalized to a greater population of counselors and clients.

Second, the study should be replicated exclusively with clients from either high school or college. The clients in this study were both students in high school and college, and results might differ in an exclusive population.

Third, for any further examination, additional instruments might be used. Truax and Carkhuff[4] present several methods of further analyzing counseling sessions. Their techniques could be employed along with the Counseling Session Reports.

Fourth, since the comparison of counselor and client responses yielded so many significant differences in comparison to counselor-counselor and client-client comparisons, further research seems in order with respect to possible differences of opinion between counselors and clients over (1) the role of the counselor and (2) the process of counseling.

Fifth, the Counseling Session Report has demonstrated its ability to evaluate the process of counseling. It is conveniently divided into sections, and certainly particular sections, such as those regarding the feelings of counselors and clients during sessions, could be used alone in further, more detailed examinations of a descriptive nature.

Sixth, comparisons of the results of this study to previous research examining the process of psychotherapy indicate that striking similarities exist.[5] A comparison of counselor and client responses to the Counseling Session Report with therapist and patient responses to the Therapy Session Report would seem quite in order.

Seventh, the relationship between personal characteristics and counseling effectiveness cannot be ignored. Both of the methods of practicum training employed in this study have exhibited positive qualities. The personal attitudes were fostered in Group I, but more didactic training was offered in Group II. Both are important and it is recommended that sensitivity training, personal counseling, feedback on performance (Group I experiences); and movies, tapes, lectures, and didactic assignments (Group II experiences) should all be incorporated into a practicum experience to further maximize future counseling effectiveness.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Chapter II of this dissertation.

[2] Lewis, G.J., Approaches to Counseling Practicum: A Comparison of the Introspective-Experiential and the Didactic-Behavioristic Paradigms, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1969.

[3] Orlinsky and Howard, op.cit., pp. 1-11.

[4] Truax, Charles B, and Robert R. Carkhuff, Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy: Training and Practice, Section 1, pp. 1-219.

[5] Howard, Kenneth I., Personal Communication.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Orlinsky, David E., and Kenneth I. Howard. Inside Psychotherapy: An Exploration of Patients' and Therapists' Experiences. In press.

Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

______________. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.

Snyder, William U. The Psychotherapy Relationship. New York: Macmillan, 1961.

Tate, Merle W. Statistics in Education and Psychology. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

Truax, Charles B., and Robert R. Carkhuff. Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy: Training and Practice. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

American Personnel and Guidance Association. The Counselor: Professional Preparation and Role: A Statement of Policy. Reprinted in Personnel and Guidance Journal. Vol. 42, No. 5, January, 1964, pp. 536-541.

Bown, O.H. An Investigation of Therapeutic Relationships in Client-Centered Psychotherapy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954.

Lewis, G. J. Approaches to Counseling Practicum: A Comparison of the Introspective-Experiential and the Didactic-Behavioristic Paradigms. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1969.

Northwestern University, Announcement of Courses, 1967-1968.

Northwestern University, School of Education Brochure, 1967.

Orlinsky David E., and Kenneth I. Howard. "Dimensions of Conjoint Experiential Process in Psychotherapy Relationships." Paper presented at American Psychological Association 75th Annual Convention, 1967.

C. PERIODICALS

Allen, Thomas W. "Effectiveness of Counselor Trainees as a Function of Psychological Openness." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1967, pp. 35-40.

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. "Dimensions of Therapist Response as Causal Factors in Therapeutic Change." Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, Vol. 76, No. 43, 1962, Whole.

Board, Francis A. "Patients and Physician's Judgments of Outcome of Psychotherapy in An Outpatient Clinic." A.M.A. Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 79, No. 1, 1959, pp. 188-196.

Canon, Harry J. "Personality Variables and Counselor-Client Affect." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 11, No. 1, 1964, pp. 35-41.

Carkhuff, Robert R., and Mae Alexik. "Effect of Client Depth of Self-exploration Upon High- and Low-Functioning Counselors." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 14, No. 4, 1967, pp. 350-355.

Combs, Arthur W., and Daniel W. Soper. "The Perceptual Organization of Effective Counselors." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 10, No. 3, 1963, pp. 222-226.

Demos, G. D., and F. H. Zawaylif. "Characteristics of Effective Counselors." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 5, No. 3, 1966, pp. 163-165.

Feidler, F. E. "A Comparison of Therapeutic Relationships in Psychoanalytic, Non-directive, and Adlerian Psychotherapy." Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 14, No. 6, 1950, pp. 436-445.

Feifel, Herman, and Janet Eells. "Patients and Therapists Assess the Same Psychotherapy." Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 27, No. 4, 1963, pp. 310-318.

Johnson, Dorothy, Bruce Shertzer, James Linden, and Shelley Stone. "The Relations of Counselor Candidate Characteristics and Counseling Effectiveness." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 6, No. 4, 1967, pp. 297-304.

Joslin, Leeman C., Jr. "Knowledge and Counselor Competence." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 43, No. 8, 1965, pp. 790-795.

Kratochvil, Daniel, David Aspy, and Robert Carkhuff. "The Differential Effects of Absolute Level and Direction of Growth in Counselor Functioning Upon Client Level of Functioning." Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 23, No. 2, 1967, pp. 216-217.

Orlinsky, David E., and Kenneth I. Howard. "The Experience of Psychotherapy: A Prospectus on the Psychotherapy Session Report." Institute for Juvenile Research, Research Report, Vol. 3, No. 8, 1966, pp. 1-11.

________________________________. "The Good Therapy Hour." Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 16, No. 5, 1967, pp. 621-632.

Mills, D. H., and R. Mencke. "Characteristics of Effective Counselors: A Reevaluation." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 6, No. 4, 1967, pp. 332-334.

Review of Educational Research, Vol. 36, No. 2, April, 1966.

Rogers Carl R. "Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change." Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1957, pp. 95-103.

____________. "The Therapeutic Relationship: Recent Theory and Research." Australian Journal of Psychology, Vol. 17, No. 2, 1965, pp. 95-108.

Rosen, Julius. "Multiple-Regression Analysis of Counselor Characteristics and Competencies." Psychological Reports, Vol. 20, No. 3, 1967, pp. 1003-1008.

Schoch, Eugene W. "Practicum Counselor's Behavioral Changes." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1966, pp. 57-62.

Stefflre, Buford, Paul King, and Fred Leafgren. "Characteristics of Counselors Judged Effective by Their Peers." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1962, pp. 335-340.

Truax, Charles B. "Effective Ingredients in Psychotherapy: An Approach to Unraveling the Patient-Therapist Interaction." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 10, No. 3, 1963, pp. 256-263.

________________ and Robert R. Carkhuff. "Client and Therapist Transparency in the Psychotherapeutic Encounter." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1965, pp. 3-9.

Waskow, Irene E. "Counselor Attitudes and Client Behavior." Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 27, No. 5, 1963, pp. 405-412.

COUNSELING SESSION REPORT

This booklet contains a series of questions about the counseling session which you have just completed. These questions have been designed to make the description of your experiences in the counseling session quick and simple.

This booklet is being used only for research purposes. Your name will not be used, and no one will know how you personally filled out the answers. The research is only concerned with how the average student responds. Once you fill out the booklet, you will only be a number on an IBM card. However, please answer honestly and carefully, because your responses will be very important in studying and improving counseling sessions.

BE SURE TO ANSWER EVERY QUESTION

IDENTIFICATION _______________

DATE OF SESSION _______________

There are two types of questions. One type is like the question on this page. It is a question followed by a list of statements. You should read each of these statements and select the one which comes closest to describing your answer to that question. You should then circle the number in front of the answer that you choose.

The other type of question is like the one on the next page. Each part of the question is followed by a series of numbers on the right-hand side of the page. After you read each of the questions, you should circle the best number in your case. For example, you would circle 0 if your answer is NONE, or 1 if your answer is SOME.

BE SURE TO ANSWER EVERY QUESTION

---

1. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE COUNSELING SESSION WHICH YOU HAVE JUST COMPLETED? (Circle the one answer which you agree with the most.)

THIS COUNSELING SESSION WAS:

1. Perfect.
2. Excellent.
3. Very good.
4. Pretty good.
5. Fair.
6. Pretty poor.
7. Very poor.

WHAT SUBJECTS DID YOU TALK ABOUT DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION?
(For each subject, circle the best answer in your case)

DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION I TALKED ABOUT:

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
2.	My mother	0	1	2
3.	My father	0	1	2
4.	My brothers or sisters	0	1	2
5.	Childhood experiences	0	1	2
6.	School work, classroom activities	0	1	2
7.	Teachers	0	1	2
8.	Religion or church experiences	0	1	2
9.	Extra-curricular activities, clubs, athletics, student government, Etc.	0	1	2
10.	Planning for college	0	1	2
11.	The draft	0	1	2
12.	Tests I might take	0	1	2
13.	Boyfriends or girlfriends	0	1	2
14.	Money	0	1	2
15.	Household chores or responsibilities	0	1	2
16.	My physical appearance	0	1	2
17.	Daydreams or things I make up	0	1	2
18.	Hobbies and interests, play, part-time jobs, leisure time activities	0	1	2
19.	Attitudes or feelings toward my counselor	0	1	2
20.	Attitudes or feelings about counseling	0	1	2
21.	Other____________________________		1	2

WHAT DID YOU WANT OR HOPE TO GET OUT OF THIS COUNSELING SESSION?
(For each item circle the best answer in your case)

IN THIS SESSION I HOPED OR WANTED TO:

	NONE	SOME	A LOT
22. Get a chance to say whatever I wanted to	0	1	2
23. Learn more about what to do in counseling and what to expect from it	0	1	2
24. Get help in talking about what is really troubling me	0	1	2
25. Try to get rid of nervous or unpleasant feelings	0	1	2
26. Better understand the reasons for my feelings and behavior	0	1	2
27. Get some compliments on how I am doing	0	1	2
28. Get confidence to try new things, to be a different kind of person	0	1	2
29. Find out what my feelings really are, and what I really want	0	1	2
30. Get advice about making some specific goals	0	1	2
31. Have my counselor treat me as a friend	0	1	2
32. Get better self control	0	1	2
33. Better understand the difference between what is real and what I make up	0	1	2
34. Work out a particular problem that has been bothering me	0	1	2
35. Get my counselor to say what he or she really thinks	0	1	2
36. Other ______________________		1	2

WHAT PROBLEMS OR FEELINGS WERE YOU CONCERNED ABOUT DURING THIS SESSION? (For each item, circle the best answer in your case).

DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION I WAS CONCERNED ABOUT:

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
37.	Being dependent on others.	0	1	2
38.	Meeting my obligations and responsibilities.	0	1	2
39.	Being assertive or competitive.	0	1	2
40.	Living up to my conscience: shameful or guilty feelings.	0	1	2
41.	Being lonely or isolated.	0	1	2
42.	Relationships with those of the opposite sex, dating behavior, boyfriend or girlfriend, going steady, Etc.	0	1	2
43.	Expressing or exposing myself to others. (letting them know how I really feel about things.)	0	1	2
44.	Loving: being able to give of myself.	0	1	2
45.	Angry feelings or behavior.	0	1	2
46.	Who I am and what I want.	0	1	2
47.	Fearful or panicky experiences.	0	1	2
48.	Meaning little or nothing to others: being worthless, or unlovable.	0	1	2
49.	Other ______________________	0	1	2

WHAT WERE YOUR FEELINGS DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION?
(For each feeling, circle the best answer in your case)

DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION I FELT:

	NONE	SOME	A LOT		NONE	SOME	A LOT
50. Confident	0	1	2	66. Nervous	0	1	2
51. Embarrassed	0	1	2	67. Affectionate	0	1	2
52. Relaxed	0	1	2	68. Serious	0	1	2
53. Shy	0	1	2	69. Afraid	0	1	2
54. Helpless	0	1	2	70. Angry	0	1	2
55. Stubborn	0	1	2	71. Pleased	0	1	2
56. Grateful	0	1	2	72. Confused	0	1	2
57. Relieved	0	1	2	73. Discouraged	0	1	2
58. Friendly	0	1	2	74. Cautious	0	1	2
59. Impatient	0	1	2	75. Frustrated	0	1	2
60. Guilty	0	1	2	76. Hopeful	0	1	2
61. Strange	0	1	2	77. Tired	0	1	2
62. Inadequate	0	1	2	78. Sick	0	1	2
63. Likeable	0	1	2	79. Thirsty	0	1	2
64. Hurt	0	1	2	80. Other ________		1	2
65. Sad	0	1	2				

	DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION:	Slightly or not at all	Some	Pretty Much	Very Much
81.	How much did you talk?	0	1	2	3
82.	How much were you able to talk about what was of real concern to you?	0	1	2	3
83.	How much did you bring up the subjects that were talked about?	0	1	2	3
84.	How well were you able to express yourself?	0	1	2	3
85.	How much were your feelings stirred up? How much were you mad, happy, excited, sad, Etc.?	0	1	2	3
86.	How much did you talk about what you were feeling?	0	1	2	3
87.	How much were you angry or critical towards yourself?	0	1	2	3
88.	How much did you have trouble thinking of things to talk about?	0	1	2	3
89.	How much friendliness or respect did you show towards your counselor?	0	1	2	3
90.	How much did you say things as they came to your mind?	0	1	2	3
91.	How much did you try to talk your counselor into seeing things your way?	0	1	2	3
92.	How much were you paying attention to what your counselor was trying to get across to you?	0	1	2	3
93.	How much did you tend to accept or agree with what your counselor said?	0	1	2	3
94.	How much did you have a feeling of control over your feelings and behavior?	0	1	2	3
95.	How much were you unfriendly or critical towards your counselor?	0	1	2	3
96.	How much were you satisfied or	0	1	2	3

97. HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT COMING TO THIS COUNSELING SESSION?
(Circle the number of the best answer in your case)

1. Eager; I could hardly wait to get here.
2. Very much looking forward to coming.
3. Looking forward to coming a little bit.
4. Did not care whether I came or not.
5. A little unwilling to come.
6. Very unwilling; I felt I did not want to come at all.

98. HOW MUCH PROGRESS DO YOU FEEL YOU HAVE MADE IN THIS COUNSELING SESSION IN DEALING WITH ANY PROBLEMS OR CONCERNS YOU MIGHT HAVE?
(Circle the number of the best answer in your case)

1. A great deal of progress, excellent progress.
2. A lot of progress, very good progress.
3. Some progress, about average.
4. Very little progress, poor progress.
5. No progress, did not get anywhere in this session.
6. In some ways my problems seem to have gotten worse.

99. HOW WELL DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU ARE GETTING ALONG IN YOUR EVERY DAY LIFE AT THIS TIME?
(Circle the number of the best answer in your case)

1. Very well; much the way I would like to.

2. Quite well; no important complaints.

3. Fairly well; I have my ups and downs.

4. So-so; I manage to keep going with some effort.

5. Fairly poorly; Life gets pretty tough at times.

6. Quite poorly; I can barely manage to deal with things.

100. IF YOU WERE TO HAVE ANOTHER COUNSELING SESSION AT A LATER DATE, TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU BE LOOKING FORWARD TO IT?
(Circle the number of the best answer in your case)

1. Intensely; would wish it were much sooner.
2. Very much; would wish it were somewhat sooner.
3. Pretty much; would be pleased when the time came.
4. Moderately; if it were scheduled, I guess I would be there.
5. Very little; I am not sure I would want to come.

WHAT DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU GOT OUT OF THIS SESSION?
(For each item, circle the answer which best applies)

I FEEL THAT I GOT:		NONE	SOME	A LOT
105.	A chance to say whatever I wanted to.	0	1	2
106.	A chance to learn more about counseling	0	1	2
107.	Help in talking about what is really troubling me.	0	1	2
108.	Relief from tensions, nervousness, or unpleasant feelings.	0	1	2
109.	More understanding of the reasons for my feelings and behavior.	0	1	2
110.	Reassurance and encouragement about how I am doing.	0	1	2
111.	Confidence to try to do things differently.	0	1	2
112.	More ability to recognize my feelings and what I really want.	0	1	2
113.	Advice about making some specific goals.	0	1	2
114.	More of a friendly relationship with my counselor.	0	1	2
115.	Better self control over my moods and actions.	0	1	2
116.	A more realistic picture of my thoughts and feelings.	0	1	2
117.	Nothing in particular: I feel the same as I did before the session.	0	1	2
118.	Other ____________________		1	2

119. HOW WELL DID YOUR COUNSELOR SEEM TO UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU WERE FEELING AND THINKING THIS SESSION?
(Circle the number of the best answer in your case)

MY COUNSELOR:

1. Understood exactly how I thought and felt.

2. Understood very well how I thought and felt.

3. Understood pretty well, but there were some things he (she) did not seem to grasp.

4. Did not understand too well how I thought and felt.

5. Misunderstood how I thought and felt.

120. HOW HELPFUL DO YOU FEEL YOUR COUNSELOR WAS TO YOU THIS SESSION?
(Circle the number of the best answer in your case)

MY COUNSELOR WAS:

1. Completely helpful.

2. Very helpful.

3. Pretty helpful.

4. Somewhat helpful.

5. Slightly helpful.

6. Not helpful at all.

DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION:		Slightly or not at all	Some	Pretty Much	Very Much
121.	How much did your counselor talk?	0	1	2	3
122.	How much was your counselor attentive to what you were trying to get across to him?	0	1	2	3
123.	How much did your counselor tend to accept or agree with your ideas and point of view?	0	1	2	3
124.	How much was your counselor displeased or critical towards you?	0	1	2	3
125.	How much did your counselor bring up the subjects that were talked about?	0	1	2	3
126.	How much did your counselor try to change your point of view or way of doing things?	0	1	2	3
127.	How much was your counselor friendly and warm towards you?	0	1	2	3
128.	How much did your counselor show his feelings?	0	1	2	3

HOW DID YOUR COUNSELOR SEEM TO FEEL DURING THIS SESSION?
(For each item, circle the answer which best applies)

MY COUNSELOR SEEMED:

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
129.	Pleased	0	1	2
130.	Thoughtful	0	1	2
131.	Annoyed	0	1	2
132.	Bored	0	1	2
133.	Sympathetic	0	1	2
134.	Cheerful	0	1	2
135.	Frustrated	0	1	2
136.	Involved	0	1	2
137.	Insincere	0	1	2
138.	Demanding	0	1	2
139.	Apprehensive	0	1	2
140.	Effective	0	1	2
141.	Perplexed	0	1	2
142.	Detached	0	1	2

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
143.	Friendly	0	1	2
144.	Confident	0	1	2
145.	Relaxed	0	1	2
146.	Interested	0	1	2
147.	Unsure	0	1	2
148.	Optimistic	0	1	2
149.	Distracted	0	1	2
150.	Affectionate	0	1	2
151.	Alert	0	1	2
152.	Close to me	0	1	2
153.	Tired	0	1	2
154.	Other ________		1	2

APPENDIX B

COUNSELING SESSION REPORT

This booklet contains a series of questions about the counseling session which you have just completed. These questions have been designed to make the description of your experiences in the counseling session quick and simple.

This booklet is being used only for research purposes. Your name will not be used, and no one will know how you personally filled out the answers. The research is only concerned with how the average student responds. Once you fill out the booklet, you will only be a number on an IBM card. However, please answer honestly and carefully, because your responses will be very important in studying and improving counseling sessions.

BE SURE TO ANSWER EVERY QUESTION

IDENTIFICATION________________

DATE OF SESSION________________

There are two types of questions. One type is like the question on this page. It is a question followed by a list of statements. You should read each of these statements and select the one which comes closest to describing your answer to that question. You should then circle the number in front of the answer that you choose.

The other type of question is like the one on the next page. Each part of the question is followed by a series of numbers on the right-hand side of the page. After you read each of the questions, you should circle the best number in your case. For example, you would circle 0 if your answer is NONE, or 1 if your answer is SOME.

BE SURE TO ANSWER EVERY QUESTION

---

1. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE COUNSELING SESSION WHICH YOU HAVE JUST COMPLETED? (Circle the one answer which you agree with the most.)

THIS COUNSELING SESSION WAS:

1. Perfect.
2. Excellent.
3. Very good.
4. Pretty good.
5. Fair.
6. Pretty poor.
7. Very poor.

Co-- 2

WHAT SUBJECTS DID YOUR COUNSELEE TALK ABOUT DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION? (For each subject, circle the best answer)

DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION MY COUNSELEE TALKED ABOUT:

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
2.	Mother	0	1	2
3.	Father	0	1	2
4.	Brothers or sisters	0	1	2
5.	Childhood experiences	0	1	2
6.	School work, classroom activities	0	1	2
7.	Teachers	0	1	2
8.	Religion or church experiences	0	1	2
9.	Extra-curricular activities, clubs, athletics, student government, Etc.	0	1	2
10.	Planning for college	0	1	2
11.	The draft	0	1	2
12.	Tests that might be taken	0	1	2
13.	Boyfriends or girlfriends	0	1	2
14.	Money	0	1	2
15.	Household chores or responsibilities	0	1	2
16.	Physical appearance	0	1	2
17.	Daydreams or things he/she makes up	0	1	2
18.	Hobbies and interests, play, part-time jobs, leisure time activities	0	1	2
19.	Attitudes or feelings about counseling	0	1	2
20.	Attitudes or feelings about me	0	1	2
21.	Other ______________________	0	1	2

WHAT DID YOUR COUNSELEE SEEM TO WANT OUT OF THIS SESSION?
(For each item circle the best answer)

THIS SESSION MY COUNSELEE SEEMED TO WANT:

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
22.	A chance to say whatever he or she wanted to	0	1	2
23.	To learn more about what to do in counseling and what to expect from it	0	1	2
24.	Help in dealing with anxiety-arousing concerns	0	1	2
25.	Relief from tension or unhappy feelings	0	1	2
26.	Better understanding of reasons for problematic feelings or behavior	0	1	2
27.	Reassurance or approval from me	0	1	2
28.	To evade or withdraw from effective contact with me	0	1	2
29.	To explore emerging feelings and experiences	0	1	2
30.	Advice about making some specific goals	0	1	2
31.	Me to treat him or her as a friend	0	1	2
32.	Help in controlling feelings or impulses	0	1	2
33.	Help in evaluating feelings and reactions	0	1	2
34.	To work through a particular problem	0	1	2
35.	My frank opinion or evaluation	0	1	2
36.	Other ____________________	0	1	2

Co-- 4

WHAT DID YOUR COUNSELEE SEEM TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT DURING THIS SESSION? (For each item, circle the most appropriate answer)

DURING THIS SESSION MY COUNSELEE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT:

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
37.	Being dependent on others.	0	1	2
38.	Meeting obligations and responsibilities.	0	1	2
39.	Being assertive or competitive.	0	1	2
40.	The demands of conscience: shameful	0	1	2
41.	Being lonely or isolated.	0	1	2
42.	Relationships with those of the opposite sex, dating behavior, Etc.	0	1	2
43.	Expressing himself (herself) to others.	0	1	2
44.	Loving: being able to give of himself (herself) to others.	0	1	2
45.	Angry feelings or behavior.	0	1	2
46.	Personal identity and aspirations.	0	1	2
47.	Fearful or panicky experiences.	0	1	2
48.	Meaning little or nothing to others: being worthless or unlovable.	0	1	2
49.	Other ______________________		1	2

C[illegible] 5

HOW DID YOUR COUNSELEE SEEM TO FEEL DURING THIS SESSION?
(For each feeling, circle the answer which best applies)

MY COUNSELEE SEEMED TO FEEL:

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
50.	Confident	0	1	2
51.	Embarrassed	0	1	2
52.	Relaxed	0	1	2
53.	Shy	0	1	2
54.	Helpless	0	1	2
55.	Stubborn	0	1	2
56.	Grateful	0	1	2
57.	Relieved	0	1	2
58.	Friendly	0	1	2
59.	Impatient	0	1	2
60.	Guilty	0	1	2
61.	Strange	0	1	2
62.	Inadequate	0	1	2
63.	Likeable	0	1	2
64.	Hurt	0	1	2
65.	Sad	0	1	2

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
66.	Nervous	0	1	2
67.	Affectionate	0	1	2
68.	Serious	0	1	2
69.	Afraid	0	1	2
70.	Angry	0	1	2
71.	Pleased	0	1	2
72.	Confused	0	1	2
73.	Discouraged	0	1	2
74.	Cautious	0	1	2
75.	Frustrated	0	1	2
76.	Hopeful	0	1	2
77.	Tired	0	1	2
78.	Sick	0	1	2
79.	Thirsty	0	1	2
80.	Other ________		1	2

DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION:	Slightly or not at all	Some	Pretty Much	Very Much
81. How much did your counselee talk?	0	1	2	3
82. How much was your counselee able to focus on what was of present concern to him (her)?	0	1	2	3
83. How much did your counselee take the initiative in bringing up the subjects that were talked about?	0	1	2	3
84. How well was your counselee able to express himself?	0	1	2	3
85. Were your counselee's feelings stirred up?	0	1	2	3
86. How much did your counselee talk about what he (she) was feeling?	0	1	2	3
87. How much was your counselee self-critical or self-rejecting?	0	1	2	3
88. How much did your counselee have trouble thinking of things to talk about?	0	1	2	3
89. How much was your counselee warm and friendly towards you?	0	1	2	3
90. How much did your counselee say things as they came to his (her) mind?	0	1	2	3
91. How much did your counselee try to talk you into seeing things his way?	0	1	2	3
92. How much was your counselee attentive to what you were trying to get across?	0	1	2	3
93. How much did your counselee tend to accept or agree with what you said?	0	1	2	3
94. How much did your counselee have control over his (her) actions and feelings?	0	1	2	3
95. How much was your counselee negative or critical towards you?	0	1	2	3
96. How much was your counselee satisfied or pleased with his (her) own behavior	0	1	2	3

97. HOW MOTIVATED WAS YOUR COUNSELEE FOR COMING TO THIS COUNSELING SESSION? (Circle the number of the best answer)

1. Very strongly motivated.
2. Strongly motivated.
3. Moderately motivated.
4. Slightly motivated.
5. Had to force himself (herself) to keep the appointment.

98. HOW MUCH PROGRESS DID YOUR COUNSELEE SEEM TO MAKE IN THIS COUNSELING SESSION IN DEALING WITH ANY PROBLEMS OR CONCERNS?
(Circle the number of the best answer)

1. A great deal of progress, excellent progress.
2. A lot of progress, very good progress.
3. Some progress, about average.
4. Very little progress, poor progress.
5. No progress, did not get anywhere in this session.
6. In some ways he (she) seems to have gotten worse.

99. HOW WELL DO YOU FEEL YOUR COUNSELEE IS GETTING ALONG IN HIS (HER) EVERY DAY LIFE AT THIS TIME?
(Circle the number of the best answer)

1. Very well; much the way he (she) would like to.
2. Quite well; no important complaints.
3. Fairly well; has ups and downs.
4. So-so; manages to cope with life with some effort.
5. Fairly poorly; life gets pretty tough at times.
6. Quite poorly; can varely manage to cope with life.

Co-- 8

IN WHAT DIRECTIONS WERE YOU WORKING WITH YOUR COUNSELEE THIS SESSION?
(For each item, circle the answer which best applies.)

I WAS WORKING TOWARD:

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
101.	Helping my counselee feel accepted in our relationship.	0	1	2
102.	Getting a better understanding of my counselee, of what was really going on.	0	1	2
103.	Helping my counselee talk about his (her) concerns.	0	1	2
104.	Helping my counselee get relief from tensions or unhappy feelings.	0	1	2
105.	Helping my counselee understand the reasons behind his (her) reactions.	0	1	2
106.	Supporting my counselee's self-esteem and confidence.	0	1	2
107.	Encouraging attempts to change and try new ways of behaving.	0	1	2
108.	Moving my counselee closer to experiencing emergent feelings.	0	1	2
109.	Helping my counselee explore new ways for dealing with self and others.	0	1	2
110.	Establishing a genuine person-to-person relationship with my counselee.	0	1	2
111.	Helping my counselee get better self-control over feelings and impulses.	0	1	2
112.	Helping my counselee realistically evaluate feelings and reactions.	0	1	2
113.	Sharing empathically in what my counselee was experiencing.	0	1	2
114.	Getting my counselee to take a more active role and responsibility for progress in counseling.	0	1	2

115. HOW MUCH WERE YOU LOOKING FORWARD TO SEEING YOUR COUNSELEE THIS SESSION? (Circle the one answer which best applies.)

1. I definitely anticipated a meaningful or pleasant session.
2. I had some pleasant anticipation.
3. I had no particular anticipations but found myself pleased to see my counselee when the time came.
4. I felt neutral about seeing my counselee this session.
5. I anticipated a trying or somewhat unpleasant session.

116. TO WHAT EXTENT DID YOUR OWN STATE OF MIND OR PERSONAL REACTIONS TEND TO INTERFERE WITH YOUR COUNSELING EFFORTS DURING THIS SESSION? (Circle the one answer which best applies.)

1. Considerably.
2. Moderately.
3. Somewhat.
4. Slightly.
5. Not at all.

117. TO WHAT EXTENT DID YOU REVEAL YOUR SPONTANEOUS IMPRESSIONS OR REACTIONS TO YOUR COUNSELEE THIS SESSION? (Circle the one answer which best applies.)

1. Considerably.
2. Moderately.
3. Somewhat.
4. Slightly.
5. Not at all.

118. TO WHAT EXTENT WERE YOU IN RAPPORT WITH YOUR COUNSELEE'S FEELINGS? (Circle the one answer which best applies.)

1. Completely.
2. Almost completely.
3. A great deal.
4. A fair amount.
5. Some.
6. Little.

119. HOW MUCH OF WHAT YOUR COUNSELEE SAID AND DID DO YOU FEEL YOU UNDERSTOOD? (Circle the one answer which best applies.)

1. Everything.
2. Almost all.
3. A great deal.
4. A fair amount.
5. Some.
6. Little.

120. HOW HELPFUL DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU WERE TO YOUR COUNSELEE THIS SESSION? (Circle the one answer which best applies.)

1. Completely helpful.
2. Very helpful.
3. Pretty helpful.
4. Somewhat helpful.
5. Slightly helpful.
6. Not at all helpful.

DURING THIS COUNSELING SESSION, HOW MUCH:

		Slightly or not at all	Some	Pretty Much	Very Much
121.	Did you talk?	0	1	2	3
122.	Were you attentive to what your counselee was trying to get across?	0	1	2	3
123.	Did you tend to agree with or accept your counselee's ideas or suggestions?	0	1	2	3
124.	Were you critical or disapproving toward your counselee?	0	1	2	3
125.	Did you take the initiative in defining the issues that were talked about?	0	1	2	3
126.	Did you try to change your counselee's point of view or way of doing things?	0	1	2	3
127.	Were you warm and friendly towards your counselee?	0	1	2	3
128.	Did you express feeling?	0	1	2	3

HOW DID YOU FEEL DURING THIS SESSION?
(For each item, circle the answer which best applies.)

DURING THIS SESSION I FELT:

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
129.	Pleased	0	1	2
130.	Thoughtful	0	1	2
131.	Annoyed	0	1	2
132.	Bored	0	1	2
133.	Sympathetic	0	1	2
134.	Cheerful	0	1	2
135.	Frustrated	0	1	2
136.	Involved	0	1	2
137.	Insincere	0	1	2
138.	Demanding	0	1	2
139.	Apprehensive	0	1	2
140.	Effective	0	1	2
141.	Perplexed	0	1	2
142.	Detached	0	1	2

		NONE	SOME	A LOT
143.	Friendly	0	1	2
144.	Confident	0	1	2
145.	Relaxed	0	1	2
146.	Interested	0	1	2
147.	Unsure	0	1	2
148.	Optimistic	0	1	2
149.	Distracted	0	1	2
150.	Affectionate	0	1	2
151.	Alert	0	1	2
152.	Close	0	1	2
153.	Tired	0	1	2
154.	Other ________		1	2

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING TREATMENT OF COUNSELING SESSION REPORTS:

1. MAKE SURE YOU HAVE ADEQUATE COPIES OF THE REPORTS PRIOR TO EACH SCHOOL VISIT, OR EACH CLIENT HERE AT THE LAB.
2. MAKE SURE YOU HAVE ENVELOPES ONLY FOR THE CLIENT'S REPORTS.
3. FILL IN THE IDENTIFYING INFORMATION PRIOR TO EACH INTERVIEW, IN PRIVATE.
4. GIVE THE CLIENT A COUNSELING SESSION REPORT WITH A BLUE COVER AT THE END OF EACH SESSION.
5. ALSO GIVE THE CLIENT A MANILA ENVELOPE IN WHICH TO PUT HIS REPORT.
6. LEAVE THE COUNSELING ROOM, LET THE STUDENT FILL OUT HIS REPORT IN PRIVATE, AND YOU DO THE SAME, HOPEFULLY IN PRIVATE, IN AN ADJOINING ROOM OR OFFICE, FILLING OUT THE YELLOW FORM.
7. THERE WILL BE BOXES AVAILABLE, IN THE LAB, AND AT THE PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS, FOR COLLECTION OF THE REPORTS. BOTH THE COUNSELOR AND THE CLIENT WILL PUT THEIR REPORTS IN THE BOX, AND THE COUNSELOR WILL RETURN THEM TO ME AT THE LAB. MAKE CERTAIN THAT EACH CLIENT PUTS HIS REPORT IN THE BOX FOLLOWING EACH SESSION.
8. LITTLE OR NO EXPLANATION TO THE CLIENT SHOULD BE NECESSARY. GIVE EACH CLIENT THE BLUE REPORT FORM AT THE END OF EACH SESSION. THE FIRST TIME HAVE THE CLIENT READ THE DIRECTIONS ON THE COVER AND ASK IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS. THEN TELL HIM YOU ARE GOING TO LEAVE THE ROOM WHILE HE FILLS IT OUT. REMEMBER, THE ONLY PURPOSE IS RESEARCH, AND NO ONE WILL KNOW OR CARE HOW ANY ONE INDIVIDUAL FILLED OUT THE FORM! AFTER THE SECOND OR LATER SESSIONS, SIMPLY ASK THE CLIENT TO FILL OUT THE SAME FORM, FOLLOWING THE SAME PROCEDURES. ALSO BE SURE AND MENTION THE BOX OUTSIDE THE OFFICE FOR THE COMPLETED FORM.

COUNSELING SESSION REPORTS BOTH FOR COUNSELOR AND CLIENT ARE IN ROOM B IN THE GUIDANCE LABORATORY. MANILA ENVELOPES FOR THE CLIENT'S REPORTS ARE ALSO IN THE SAME ROOM. DO NOT TAKE A BIG "BUNCH" ALL AT ONCE. PLEASE TAKE ONLY AS MANY AS YOU NEED FOR ANY GIVEN SCHOOL VISIT SO THAT THERE WILL NOT BE MANY LOST OR UNNECESSARILY MUTILATED!

PLEASE LET ME KNOW IF THERE ARE ANY PROBLEMS ARISING FROM FOLLOWING THE ABOVE INSTRUCTIONS.

M. S. SILVERMAN

APPENDIX D

TABLE XXVII

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF COUNSELORS AND THEIR COUNSELEES BY GROUP

ITEM #	GROUP I CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	GROUP II CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
1	2.65	3.59	128	3.41**	2.67	3.47	109	2.84**
2	.83	.76	128	.61	.69	.71	110	.17
3	.87	.95	128	.68	.77	.80	110	.32
4	.93	.85	128	.76	.69	.75	110	.51
5	.36	.41	126	.55	.31	.52	109	1.84
6	1.54	1.40	125	.99	1.56	1.29	110	1.97*
7	.86	.76	128	.73	.85	.76	110	.64
8	.42	.39	126	.25	.36	.42	109	.45
9	1.17	1.21	125	.21	1.30	1.24	110	.42
10	1.59	1.36	128	1.54	1.66	1.59	110	.44
11	.09	.03	127	1.21	.21	.14	110	.88
12	.65	.53	126	1.04	.66	.69	110	.21
13	.54	.69	127	1.31	.49	.69	110	1.57

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

ITEM #	GROUP I CEE $\bar{X}$	GROUP I CO $\bar{X}$	GROUP I D.F.	GROUP I "t" VALUE	GROUP II CEE $\bar{X}$	GROUP II CO $\bar{X}$	GROUP II D.F.	GROUP II "t" VALUE
14	.80	.53	125	2.21*	.85	.82	110	.24
15	.30	.32	126	.19	.31	.29	110	.16
16	.11	.07	127	.77	.13	.14	110	.09
17	.10	.07	126	.57	.21	.20	110	.16
18	1.25	1.14	126	.80	1.38	1.49	110	.79
19	.29	.24	127	.55	.18	.35	110	1.87
20	.43	.37	126	.56	.36	.35	110	.08
21	.49	.24	127	1.82	.48	.08	110	3.14**
22	.89	1.12	128	1.58	1.10	1.12	109	.15
23	.91	.75	127	1.19	.95	.68	109	2.04*
24	.74	.44	127	2.50*	.75	.46	109	2.23*
25	.41	.51	127	.78	.52	.34	109	1.38
26	.67	.39	127	2.31*	.56	.30	109	2.16*
27	.33	.68	127	2.96**	.31	.84	109	4.03**
28	.57	.12	127	4.45** +	.67	.16	109	4.52** +

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

	GROUP I				GROUP II			
ITEM #	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
29	1.29	.64	127	4.63**	1.25	.58	109	4.82**
30	1.50	1.07	127	3.03**	1.57	1.20	109	2.72**
31	1.08	.78	128	2.33*	1.03	.72	109	2.34*
32	.40	.14	127	2.83**	.46	.18	109	2.59**
33	.23	.66	127	4.09** +	.31	.46	109	1.18 +
34	.79	.83	127	.30	.67	.86	109	1.23
35	.96	.64	127	2.36*	1.12	.68	108	2.89**
36	.27	----	---	----	.23	----	---	----
37	.33	.29	127	.39	.47	.29	109	1.45
38	.89	.76	128	.91	1.12	.73	109	2.80**
39	.51	.42	127	.75	.63	.43	109	1.62
40	.26	.14	127	1.36	.33	.10	109	2.44*
41	.17	.29	127	1.25	.18	.24	109	.60
42	.33	.15	127	1.74	.27	.29	109	.25
43	.69	.37	127	2.43*	.93	.55	109	2.59**

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

	GROUP I				GROUP II			
ITEM #	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
44	.28	.20	128	.83	.42	.24	109	1.56
45	.10	.10	127	.03	.18	.18	109	.08
46	1.21	1.10	127	.75	1.36	1.10	108	1.59
47	.27	.05	127	2.62**	.23	.20	109	.38
48	.11	.03	127	1.54	.27	.08	109	2.22*
49	.19	----	---	----	.10	.20	109	.96
50	1.21	1.17	127	.28	1.42	1.43	108	.05
51	.24	.56	127	2.92**	.28	.43	107	1.53
52	1.27	1.17	127	.67	1.39	1.29	108	.64
53	.47	.66	126	1.44	.51	.53	108	.18
54	.17	.37	127	2.09*	.20	.16	108	.59
55	.06	.19	127	2.12*	.08	.06	108	.46
56	1.31	.85	128	3.41**	1.19	.75	108	3.18**
57	.79	.39	127	3.29**	.77	.51	106	1.84
58	1.54	1.49	128	.33	1.48	1.53	109	.33

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

ITEM #	GROUP I CEE $\bar{X}$	GROUP I CO $\bar{X}$	GROUP I D.F.	GROUP I "t" VALUE	GROUP II CEE $\bar{X}$	GROUP II CO $\bar{X}$	GROUP II D.F.	GROUP II "t" VALUE
59	.17	.25	127	.93	.17	.04	107	1.90
60	.10	.12	127	.26	.10	.06	108	.73
61	.31	.24	127	.81	.37	.14	108	2.41*
62	.31	.44	127	1.21	.35	.22	106	1.40
63	1.08	1.34	128	1.75	1.02	1.10	108	.68
64	.01	.03	127	.73	----	.04	----	----
65	.04	.02	127	.68	.05	.04	108	.29
66	.79	.86	127	.58	.76	.68	107	.60
67	.20	.76	126	5.04**	.25	.52	107	2.30*
68	1.46	1.17	126	2.11*	1.39	1.32	107	.49
69	.30	.51	126	1.68	.17	.32	107	1.79
70	.06	.07	126	.20	.03	.10	107	1.22
71	1.34	.98	127	2.58**	1.32	1.04	107	2.02*
72	.41	.53	125	.94	.61	.38	107	1.86
73	.09	.29	126	2.56*	.09	.14	106	.87

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

ITEM #	GROUP I CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	GROUP II CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
74	.46	.39	126	.68	.48	.58	106	.83
75	.20	.42	126	2.21*	.19	.22	107	.35
76	1.26	.97	126	2.20*	1.19	.88	107	2.25*
77	.29	.10	126	2.18*	.22	.04	107	2.28*
78	.10	---	---	----	.03	.02	107	.44
79	.23	.03	126	2.78**	.29	.02	107	3.13**
80	.17	---	---	----	.19	.06	107	1.39
81	2.14	2.08	128	.32	2.15	2.29	109	.74
82	2.18	1.86	128	1.73	2.20	2.04	109	.79
83	1.49	1.61	127	.64	1.32	1.51	109	1.10
84	2.01	1.92	128	.55	1.87	2.14	109	1.43
85	1.21	.92	127	1.74	.88	1.02	109	.84
86	1.40	1.42	127	.14	1.41	1.53	108	.57
87	.59	.76	127	1.14	.48	.71	107	1.80
88	.54	.86	127	1.85	.90	.78	108	.65

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

	GROUP I				GROUP II			
ITEM #	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
89	2.41	1.86	128	3.20**	2.31	1.78	108	3.10**
90	2.01	1.49	127	2.75**	1.90	1.82	109	.39
91	.56	.58	127	.14	.81	.67	108	.92
92	2.57	1.76	125	4.46**	2.50	2.12	109	2.08*
93	2.17	1.61	126	3.54**	2.22	1.88	109	2.03*
94	2.37	2.19	127	.91	2.25	2.00	108	1.28
95	.07	.12	126	.71	.12	.14	109	.24
96	1.97	1.64	126	1.76	2.02	1.73	109	1.73
97	2.15	2.63	125	2.08*	2.19	2.65	108	1.95
98	2.41	3.00	125	2.48*	2.47	2.94	108	2.06*
99	2.35	2.48	127	.57	2.40	2.39	107	.02
100	2.26	---	---	----	2.32	----	---	----
101	1.58	1.78	128	1.44	1.60	1.84	109	1.73
102	1.15	1.85	128	4.89** +	1.17	1.88	109	4.89** +
103	1.01	1.92	128	5.96**	.83	1.86	109	7.07**

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

	GROUP I				GROUP II			
ITEM #	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
104	.68	.76	128	.63	.75	.84	109	.59
105	.50	.90	127	3.00*	.53	.71	109	1.28
106	1.07	1.36	127	1.85	1.07	1.25	109	1.18
107	.65	.49	126	1.26	.57	.45	109	.96
108	.99	.71	127	2.12*	.95	.61	109	2.39*
109	1.27	.66	127	4.53**	1.23	.41	109	6.00*
110	1.39	1.85	127	3.28**	1.32	1.65	109	2.31*
111	.44	.37	127	.65	.40	.25	109	1.35
112	.87	1.00	127	.87	.93	.75	109	1.25
113	----	----	---	-----	----	----	---	----
114	----	----	---	-----	----	----	---	----
115	----	2.17	---	-----	----	1.94	---	----
116	----	4.29	---	-----	----	3.67	---	----
117	----	2.34	---	-----	----	2.08	---	----
118	----	2.66	----	-----	----	3.18	---	----

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

	GROUP I				GROUP II			
ITEM #	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
119	1.82	2.05	128	1.32	2.08	2.55	109	2.34*
120	2.17	3.58	127	5.02**	2.22	3.57	109	5.20**
121	1.90	1.63	128	1.71	1.90	1.36	109	1.72
122	2.83	2.56	128	1.61	2.77	2.65	109	.64
123	2.35	2.00	128	2.18*	2.35	2.08	109	1.52
124	.14	.24	127	1.10	.05	.06	109	.20
125	1.97	1.46	127	3.12**	2.05	1.47	109	3.36**
126	.36	.37	126	.09	.33	.31	109	.20
127	2.63	2.54	127	.47	2.53	2.45	109	.43
128	1.62	1.47	126	.38	1.48	1.45	109	.18
129	1.43	1.28	126	1.07	1.42	1.35	109	.46
130	1.65	1.24	127	3.21**	1.82	1.43	109	3.01**
131	.06	.17	127	1.56	.03	.12	108	1.68
132	.08	.10	127	.29	----	.12	---	----
133	.80	1.14	126	2.28*	.74	1.04	107	1.87

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

	GROUP I				GROUP II			
ITEM #	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
134	1.70	1.43	127	2.01*	1.77	1.37	109	3.10**
135	.03	.43	127	4.78*	.03	.27	108	3.01**
136	1.45	1.47	127	.10	1.37	1.65	108	1.80
137	.04	.07	127	.58	.07	.08	108	.19
138	.10	.17	127	1.14	.14	.24	108	1.25
139	.49	.19	125	2.65**	.42	.31	108	1.01
140	1.33	1.17	125	1.24	1.37	1.06	108	2.59**
141	.07	.28	126	2.68**	.14	.20	108	.79
142	.12	.16	125	.56	.10	.06	108	.73
143	1.80	1.78	126	.18	1.83	1.69	109	1.11
144	1.63	1.52	126	.79	1.69	1.45	108	1.84
145	1.76	1.57	126	1.37	1.60	1.51	109	.66
146	1.80	1.71	126	.68	1.85	1.84	109	.05
147	.12	.33	125	2.64**	.07	.39	108	4.22**

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

	GROUP I				GROUP II			
ITEM #	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	CEE $\bar{X}$	CO $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
148	1.35	1.41	125	.45	1.19	1.31	107	.79
149	.06	.17	125	=1.77	.10	.04	108	1.01
150	.84	1.05	125	1.43	.63	.88	108	1.89
151	1.65	1.45	125	1.42	1.73	1.59	109	1.02
152	1.13	.74	126	2.94**	.82	1.04	109	1.69
153	.07	.17	125	1.43	.07	.12	108	.75
154	.06	----	---	----	.12	----	---	----

* = "t" value significant at the .05 level or beyond

** = "t" value significant at the .01 level or beyond

+ = questions were not parallel across Co and Cee forms

TABLE XXVIII

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF COUNSELORS AND COUNSELEES ACROSS GROUPS

	COUNSELEES				COUNSELORS			
ITEM #	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"T" VALUE	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"T" VALUE
1	2.65	2.67	129	.11	3.59	3.47	108	.32
2	.83	.69	130	1.56	.76	.71	108	.45
3	.87	.77	130	1.13	.95	.80	108	1.13
4	.93	.69	130	2.53*	.85	.75	108	.80
5	.36	.31	129	.48	.41	.52	106	.85
6	1.54	1.56	129	.14	1.40	1.29	106	.64
7	.86	.85	130	.05	.76	.76	108	.01
8	.42	.36	128	.52	.39	.42	107	.22
9	1.17	1.30	128	.93	1.21	1.24	107	.16
10	1.59	1.66	130	.57	1.36	1.59	108	1.18
11	.09	.21	129	1.86	.03	.14	108	1.76
12	.65	.66	128	.03	.53	.69	108	1.11
13	.54	.49	129	.49	.69	.69	108	.06

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

	COUNSELEES				COUNSELORS			
ITEM #	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
14	.80	.85	128	.50	.53	.82	107	2.19*
15	.30	.31	128	.07	.32	.29	108	.27
16	.11	.13	129	.27	.07	.14	108	1.09
17	.10	.21	128	1.40	.07	.20	108	1.55
18	1.25	1.38	128	1.13	1.14	1.49	108	2.10*
19	.29	.18	129	1.26	.24	.35	108	1.18
20	.43	.36	128	.68	.37	.35	108	.20
21	.49	.48	129	.07	.24	.08	108	1.50
22	.89	1.10	130	1.71	1.12	1.12	107	.01
23	.91	.95	129	.28	.75	.68	107	.45
24	.74	.75	129	.09	.44	.46	107	.15
25	.41	.52	129	.90	.51	.34	107	1.27
26	.67	.56	129	.01	.39	.30	107	.79
27	.33	.31	129	.17	.68	.84	107	1.08
28	.57	.67	129	.85	.12	.16	107	.48

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

ITEM #	COUNSELEES GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	COUNSELORS GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
29	1.29	1.25	129	.29	.64	.58	107	.47
30	1.50	1.57	129	.65	1.07	1.20	107	.77
31	1.08	1.03	130	.40	.78	.72	107	.45
32	.40	.46	129	.54	.14	.18	107	.55
33	.23	.31	129	.88	.66	.46	107	1.45
34	.79	.67	129	.83	.83	.86	107	.17
35	.96	1.12	128	1.11	.64	.68	107	.27
36	.27	.23	129	.37	.00	.00	---	----
37	.33	.47	128	1.25	.29	.29	108	.06
38	.89	1.12	129	1.69	.76	.73	108	.26
39	.51	.63	128	.99	.42	.43	108	.06
40	.26	.33	128	.72	.14	.10	108	.55
41	.17	.18	128	.16	.29	.24	108	.49
42	.33	.27	128	.55	.15	.29	108	1.53
43	.69	.93	128	1.75	.37	.55	108	1.34

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

ITEM #	COUNSELEES GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	COUNSELORS GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
44	.28	.42	129	1.22	.20	.24	108	.34
45	.10	.18	128	1.16	.10	.18	108	1.04
46	1.21	1.36	127	1.01	1.10	1.10	108	.02
47	.27	.23	128	.37	.05	.20	108	2.16*
48	.11	.27	128	1.89	.03	.08	108	1.01
49	.19	.10	128	.94	.00	.20	---	----
50	1.21	1.42	128	1.97*	1.17	1.43	107	1.48
51	.24	.28	126	.39	.56	.43	108	.99
52	1.27	1.39	128	1.04	1.17	1.29	107	.90
53	.47	.51	127	.34	.66	.53	107	.90
54	.17	.20	127	.40	.37	.16	108	2.12*
55	.06	.08	127	.61	.19	.06	108	1.72
56	1.31	1.19	128	.93	.85	.75	108	.72
57	.79	.77	125	.10	.39	.51	108	.97
58	1.54	1.48	129	.51	1.49	1.53	108	.22

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

	COUNSELEES				COUNSELORS			
ITEM #	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
59	.17	.17	126	.01	.25	.04	108	2.62**
60	.10	.10	127	.03	.12	.06	108	.89
61	.31	.37	127	.58	.24	.14	108	1.12
62	.31	.35	125	.39	.44	.22	108	2.03*
63	1.08	1.02	128	.60	1.34	1.10	108	1.49
64	.01	----	---	----	.03	.04	108	.15
65	.04	.05	127	.18	.02	.04	108	.71
66	.79	.76	127	.18	.86	.68	107	1.20
67	.20	.25	126	.61	.76	.52	107	1.69
68	1.46	1.39	126	.60	1.17	1.32	107	.93
69	.30	.17	126	1.58	.51	.32	107	1.43
70	.06	.03	126	.49	.07	.10	107	.60
71	1.34	1.32	127	.16	.98	1.04	107	.37
72	.41	.61	125	1.84	.53	.38	107	1.05
73	.09	.09	125	.01	.29	.14	107	1.65

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

ITEM #	COUNSELEES GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	COUNSELORS GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
74	.46	.48	125	.19	.39	.58	107	1.74
75	.20	.19	126	.20	.42	.22	107	1.74
76	1.26	1.19	126	.62	.97	.88	107	.56
77	.29	.22	126	.71	.10	.04	107	1.08
78	.10	.03	126	1.22	----	.02	---	----
79	.23	.29	126	.59	.03	.02	107	.34
80	.17	.19	126	.13	----	.06	---	----
81	2.14	2.15	129	.07	2.08	2.29	108	.86
82	2.18	2.20	129	.12	1.86	2.04	108	.72
83	1.49	1.32	128	1.20	1.61	1.51	108	.42
84	2.01	1.87	129	1.18	1.92	2.14	108	.91
85	1.21	.88	128	2.18*	.92	1.02	108	.56
86	1.40	1.41	127	.04	1.42	1.53	108	.49
87	.59	.48	126	.80	.76	.71	107	.35
88	.54	.90	127	2.19*	.86	.78	108	.42

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

ITEM #	COUNSELEES GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	COUNSELORS GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
89	2.41	2.31	128	.84	1.86	1.78	108	.37
90	2.01	1.90	128	.69	1.49	1.82	108	1.47
91	.56	.81	127	1.70	.58	.67	108	.61
92	2.57	2.50	127	.43	1.76	2.12	107	1.65
93	2.17	2.22	127	.32	1.61	1.88	108	1.41
94	2.37	2.25	127	.72	2.19	2.00	108	.76
95	.07	.12	128	.58	.12	.14	107	.22
96	1.97	2.02	127	.32	1.64	1.73	108	.38
97	2.15	2.19	125	.23	2.63	2.65	108	.07
98	2.41	2.47	125	.40	3.00	2.94	108	.19
99	2.35	2.40	127	.25	2.48	2.39	107	.31
100	2.26	2.32	127	.37	----	----	---	----
101	1.58	1.60	129	.21	1.78	1.84	108	.36
102	1.15	1.17	129	.10	1.85	1.88	108	.20
103	1.01	.83	129	1.47	1.92	1.86	108	.29

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

	COUNSELEES				COUNSELEES			
ITEM #	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
104	.68	.75	129	.55	.76	.84	108	.50
105	.50	.53	128	.31	.90	.71	108	1.19
106	1.07	1.07	128	.03	1.36	1.25	108	.56
107	.65	.57	127	.72	.49	.45	108	.31
108	.99	.95	128	.28	.71	.61	108	.73
109	1.27	1.23	128	.28	.66	.41	108	1.87
110	1.39	1.32	128	.63	1.85	1.65	108	1.13
111	.44	.40	128	.39	.37	.25	108	1.13
112	.87	.93	128	.45	1.00	.75	108	1.57
113	.34	.52	126	1.58	1.46	1.52	107	.36
114	.06	.08	127	.40	1.12	1.10	107	.11
115	----	----	---	----	2.17	1.94	108	.85
116	----	----	---	----	4.29	3.67	108	1.55
117	----	----	---	----	2.34	2.08	108	.93
118	----	----	---	----	2.66	3.18	108	1.60

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

	COUNSELEES				COUNSELORS			
ITEM #	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
119	1.82	2.08	129	2.52*	2.05	2.55	108	1.91
120	2.17	2.22	128	.26	3.58	3.57	108	.02
121	1.90	1.90	129	.01	1.63	1.36	108	.00
122	2.83	2.77	129	.67	2.56	2.65	108	.35
123	2.35	2.35	129	.02	2.00	2.08	108	.35
124	.14	.05	128	1.43	.24	.06	108	2.27*
125	1.97	2.05	128	.54	1.46	1.47	108	.07
126	.36	.33	127	.26	.37	.31	108	.57
127	2.63	2.53	128	.75	2.54	2.45	108	.37
128	1.62	1.48	127	.91	1.47	1.45	108	.12
129	1.43	1.42	128	.11	1.28	1.35	107	.45
130	1.65	1.82	129	1.90	1.24	1.43	107	1.14
131	.06	.03	128	.52	.17	.12	107	.63
132	.08	----	---	-----	.10	.12	107	.20
133	.80	.74	126	.44	1.14	1.04	107	.56

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

	COUNSELEES				COUNSELORS			
ITEM #	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
134	1.70	1.77	129	.64	1.43	1.37	107	.34
135	.03	.03	128	.19	.43	.27	107	1.28
136	1.45	1.37	128	.64	1.47	1.65	107	1.04
137	.04	.07	128	.50	.07	.08	107	.19
138	.10	.14	128	.57	.17	.24	107	.79
139	.49	.42	126	.55	.19	.31	107	1.38
140	1.33	1.37	126	.36	1.17	1.06	107	.78
141	.07	.14	127	1.20	.28	.20	107	.80
142	.12	.10	126	.22	.16	.06	107	1.45
143	1.80	1.83	128	.36	1.78	1.69	107	.50
144	1.63	1.69	127	.62	1.52	1.45	107	.38
145	1.76	1.60	128	1.56	1.57	1.51	107	.34
146	1.80	1.85	128	.56	1.71	1.84	107	.76
147	.12	.07	126	.93	.33	.39	107	.62

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

	COUNSELEES				COUNSELORS			
ITEM #	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE	GROUP I $\bar{X}$	GROUP II $\bar{X}$	D.F.	"t" VALUE
148	1.35	1.19	125	1.15	1.41	1.31	107	.59
149	.06	.10	126	.71	.17	.04	107	2.02*
150	.84	.63	126	1.66	1.05	.88	107	1.07
151	1.65	1.73	126	.76	1.45	1.59	107	.77
152	1.13	.82	128	2.55*	.74	1.04	107	2.08*
153	.07	.07	126	.08	.17	.12	107	.66
154	.06	.12	127	.84	----	.04	---	----

* = "t" value significant at .05 level

** = "t" value significant at .01 level

VITA

Name:	Manuel Stewart Silverman	
Date and Place of Birth:	April 15, 1940 South Bend, Indiana	
Education:	John Adams High School South Bend, Indiana	1958
	Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana	B.S., 1962 M.S., 1963
	N.D.E.A. Institute in Counseling and Guidance Purdue University West Lafayette, Indiana	Summer, 1966
	Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois	Ph.D., 1969
Occupational Experiences:	English Teacher Elston Senior High School Michigan City, Indiana	1963-1966
	Assistant Professor Education Department Loyola University Chicago, Illinois	1968- ——
Organizational Memberships:	Phi Delta Kappa American Personnel and Guidance Association American School Counselor Association Association for Counselor Education and Supervision	